

Competing first passage percolation on random regular graphs *

Tonči Antunović
U.C. Berkeley
tantun@math.berkeley.edu

Yael Dekel
The Hebrew University
yaelvin@cs.huji.ac.il

Elchanan Mossel
U.C. Berkeley and Weizmann institute
mossel@stat.berkeley.edu

Yuval Peres
Microsoft Research
peres@microsoft.com

Abstract

We consider two competing first passage percolation processes started from uniformly chosen subsets of a random regular graph on N vertices. The processes are allowed to spread with different rates, start from vertex subsets of different sizes or at different times. We obtain tight results regarding the sizes of the vertex sets occupied by each process, showing that in the generic situation one process will occupy $\Theta(1)N^\alpha$ vertices, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. The value of α is calculated in terms of the relative rates of the processes, as well as the sizes of the initial vertex sets and the possible time advantage of one process.

The motivation for this work comes from the study of viral marketing on social networks. The described processes can be viewed as two competing products spreading through a social network (random regular graph). Considering the processes which grow at different rates (corresponding to different attraction levels of the two products) or starting at different times (the first to market advantage) allows to model aspects of real competition. The results obtained can be interpreted as one of the two products taking the lion share of the market. We compare these results to the same process run on d dimensional grids where we show that in the generic situation the two products will have a linear fraction of the market each.

1 Introduction

First passage percolation is one of the most studied discrete models in probability theory. It can be realized as a random graph metric when edges have independent identically distributed weights. Often the distribution is assumed to be exponential and then the ball of a radius t (from a fixed vertex) is a Markov set process $\mathcal{R}$, in which new vertices are occupied at a rate proportional to the number of their neighbors already in $\mathcal{R}(t)$. Apart from the classical shape problem on infinite transitive graphs (see [14]), recently there was substantial interest in estimating diameter, typical distance, flooding times and related quantities for the process on large finite (and possibly random) graphs [34, 46, 3, 5, 6, 4].

In a related two type Richardson model, introduced in [28], one considers two first passage percolation processes, a blue and a red one, with possibly different rates, spreading through the

*Keywords: growth process, coupling method, submodularity, social networks, viral marketing. MSC classification: 60K35, 91D30, 68Q25

graph and capturing non-colored vertices. Each non-colored vertex becomes colored with color c at the rate proportional to the number of c colored neighbors (this can also be viewed as the Voronoi tessellation with respect to two independent first passage percolation metric). A significant amount of work on this model has been devoted to identifying the cases in which both colors grow indefinitely [29, 16, 15, 17, 23, 31, 32]. In the current paper we are studying a version of this model on large random regular graphs (which are objects of independent interest [9, 36]). We are interested in the sizes of each colored component, while allowing the processes to start at different times, from sets of different sizes and spread with different rates.

From an applied point of view, this model can be viewed to simulate spreading of two products (or viruses) through a social network. In recent years, diffusion processes on social networks have been the focus of intense study in a variety of areas. Traditionally these processes have been of major interest in epidemiology where they model the spread of diseases and immunization [43, 40, 41, 20, 2, 21]. Much of the recent interest has resulted from applications in sociology, economics, and engineering [12, 1, 26, 25, 18, 45, 37, 38].

The interpretations of the diffusion process in terms of product marketing and in terms of virus spread lead to some natural questions we address in this paper. What is the advantage that the first product (the first virus) has in terms of the initial time it can spread with no competition? What is the effect of one of them starting with larger initial size (initial seed sets) than the other one or having a larger rate (higher quality of a product)? What is the effect of the structure of the social network on the outcome of the competition between the two products? To answer the last question we compare the results for the model on large random regular graphs to the same model on large d dimensional tori. The first family of graphs model some (but not all) features of current social networks (small diameter, expansion etc.) while the second family models traditional spatial graph processes that are traditionally studies in epidemiology, ecology and statistical physics. We proceed with a formal definition of the process and a statement of our main results.

1.1 Definition of the process

In the model we study in this paper we have an underlying N vertex graph G . In this graph we have two sets of vertices, $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$. We think of $\mathcal{B}_0$ as a set of *blue* vertices and of $\mathcal{R}_0$ as a set of *red* vertices. Each edge with at least one end in $\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \mathcal{R}_0$ has an independent exponential clock attached to it. Edges that have two ends in $\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \mathcal{R}_0$ have two independent exponential clocks attached to them, one for each end. The rate of the clocks on edges with an end in $\mathcal{B}_0$ is β , and the rate of the clocks on edges with an end in $\mathcal{R}_0$ is 1. When the process begins all the clocks start ticking. For every $n = 1, \dots, |E(G)|$, when the n -th clock goes off we look at the ends (u, v) of the edge whose clock went off. If $u, v \in \mathcal{B}_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{R}_{n-1}$ then we simply define $\mathcal{B}_n = \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$ and $\mathcal{R}_n = \mathcal{R}_{n-1}$, and let the other clocks continue ticking. If only one end (w.l.o.g u) is in $\mathcal{B}_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{R}_{n-1}$, then if $u \in \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$ we define $\mathcal{B}_n = \mathcal{B}_{n-1} \cup \{v\}$, $\mathcal{R}_n = \mathcal{R}_{n-1}$, and assign all the other edges attached to v exponential clocks with rate β . If $u \in \mathcal{R}_{n-1}$ then we define $\mathcal{B}_n = \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$, $\mathcal{R}_n = \mathcal{R}_{n-1} \cup \{v\}$, and assign all the other edges attached to v exponential clocks with rate 1. Denote $\bar{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}_{|E(G)|}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}_{|E(G)|}$. Throughout the paper we denote the size of $\mathcal{B}_n$ ($\mathcal{R}_n$) by B_n (R_n), and the size of $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ ($\bar{\mathcal{R}}$) by $\bar{B}$ ($\bar{R}$).

In this paper we study the asymptotic sizes of $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ depending on how $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$ were generated, on their initial sizes and on the rate parameter β . Our research focuses mainly on the case where the underlying graph G is a random regular graph.

The random N -vertex d -regular graph $\mathcal{G}(N, d)$ is the uniform distribution over all graphs with N vertices where all the degrees are exactly d (d -regular graphs exist only for N, d such that dN

is even). For this model we obtain tight results regarding the asymptotic behavior of $\bar{B}$ and $\bar{R}$, for two different ways of generating the sets $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$. The first, is letting $\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{R}_0$ be two uniformly random sets of some predetermined sizes B_0 and R_0 respectively. The second, is picking a random set of size k , coloring it *blue* and letting it spread as described above (but with $\mathcal{R}_0 = \emptyset$) until it grows to some predetermined size B_0 . We then define $\mathcal{B}_0$ as the set of *blue* vertices, and $\mathcal{R}_0$ as a random set in $V \setminus \mathcal{B}_0$. The results we obtain are for both $\beta = 1$ and $\beta \neq 1$.

Another graph we study in this paper is the d dimensional torus. We show that when this is the underlying graph then even if we give the *blue* vertices a huge advantage (i.e., we let $\mathcal{B}_0$ contain a linear fraction of the vertices, we let $\mathcal{R}_0$ contain only one vertex and we let the *blue* vertices spread at a greater rate than the *red* vertices), with high probability the *red* vertices still occupy a linear fraction of the vertices at the end of the process. This situation is different than the situation in the random regular graph, where except for some special cases (described in Thm. 1.1), one color almost surely occupies $(1 - o(1))N$ vertices.

1.2 Main results

We now rigorously state our main results:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a random N -vertex d -regular graph and let $B_0, R_0 > 0$ be the initial sizes of $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$, and $\beta > 0$. Let $\mathcal{B}_0$ be a uniformly random set of B_0 vertices, and $\mathcal{R}_0$ a uniformly random set of R_0 vertices. The blue vertices spread with rate β and the red vertices spread with rate 1. Define $\gamma = 1 - \alpha_1 - \beta(1 - \alpha_2)$. Then*

i) *if $B_0 = N^{\alpha_1}$ and $R_0 = N^{\alpha_2}$ for some $0 < \alpha_1, \alpha_2 < 1$ then there are two cases.*

- *If $\gamma \geq 0$ then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta, d$ such that with high probability the final number of blue vertices is $\bar{B} = (1 + o(1))CN^{\alpha_1 + \beta(1 - \alpha_2)}$, and the rest are red.*
- *If $\gamma \leq 0$ then there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta, d$ such that with high probability the final number of red vertices is $\bar{R} = (1 + o(1))CN^{\alpha_2 + (1 - \alpha_1)/\beta}$, and the rest are blue.*

ii) *If $B_0 = b_0$ and $R_0 = r_0$ for some constants $b_0, r_0 > 0$ then*

- *If $\beta \leq 1$ then with high probability the final number of blue vertices is $\bar{B} = \Theta(N^\beta)$, and the rest are red.*
- *If $\beta \geq 1$ then with high probability the final number of red vertices is $\bar{R} = \Theta(N^{1/\beta})$, and the rest are blue.*

iii) *If $B_0 = b_0$ for some constant $b_0 > 0$, and $R_0 = N^{\alpha_2}$ for some $0 < \alpha_2 < 1$ then*

- *If $\beta(1 - \alpha_2) \leq 1$ then with high probability the final number of blue vertices is $\bar{B} = \Theta(N^{\beta(1 - \alpha_2)})$, and the rest are red.*
- *If $\beta(1 - \alpha_2) \geq 1$ then with high probability the final number of red vertices is $\bar{R} = \Theta(N^{\alpha_2 + 1/\beta})$, and the rest are blue.*

Theorem 1.2. *The conclusion in Thm. 1.1 holds also if $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$ are generated in the following way: Choose a uniformly random set $\mathcal{B}$ containing k vertices, for some $k < B_0$. $\mathcal{B}$ starts spreading with rate β until the (random) time τ when the number of blue vertices reaches B_0 . $\mathcal{B}_0$ is defined as the blue vertex set at time τ . For the red vertex set, choose $\mathcal{R}_0$ of size R_0 , uniformly at random from the set $V \setminus \mathcal{B}_0$.*

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\mathbb{T}(N, d) = (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^d$ for n such that $N = n^d$, be the d -dimensional torus with N vertices. Choose a random vertex, color it blue, and let it spread until there are εN blue vertices for some $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Define $\mathcal{B}_0$ to be the blue set at this time. Choose a random uncolored vertex and define $\mathcal{R}_0$ to be this single vertex. The blue and red vertices continue to spread, the blue vertices with rate $\beta > 1$ and the red vertices with rate 1. Then with high probability, at the end of the process both colors occupy $\Theta(N)$ vertices.*

In Sec. 4 we prove Thm. 4.1 about a new urn model that may be of independent interest. This theorem is used in the proofs of the theorems above.

1.3 Remarks and follow up work

We note that the results of all the theorems above cannot hold if the sets $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$ are arbitrary. Consider for example the case where $\mathcal{B}_0$ is the ball of radius r in the graph around a vertex v and $\mathcal{R}_0$ consists of all vertices at distance exactly $r + 1$ from v . While the set $\mathcal{R}_0$ is not much bigger than $\mathcal{B}_0$ - clearly the remaining vertices will all become red.

The fact that the results do not hold for arbitrary sets raise various game theoretic questions. For example, consider a game where player B has to choose the set $\mathcal{B}_0$ and player R has to choose the set $\mathcal{R}_0$. Suppose player B can choose up to N^{α_1} initial vertices and player R can choose up to N^{α_2} initial vertices. What are the Nash Equilibria of this game? Are the payoffs in the Nash Equilibria close to the payoffs obtained if the two players place the initial sets at random? Similar game theoretic questions may be asked if players alternate in placing the elements of $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$.

As far as we know this game was first defined by Bharathi, Kempe and Salek in [7]. Their paper provides an approximation algorithm for the best response and shows that the social price of competition is at most 2 but does not analyze the utilities of each of the players in a Nash Equilibria. A different direction of future study is extending the result in the current paper to more realistic models of social networks and marketing. In particular it would be interesting to study the same question on preferential attachment random graphs and other more realistic models of social networks. We expect that for such graphs, game theoretic consideration can play an important role due to the different degrees and connectivity of different vertices.

1.4 Related work

As mentioned earlier, diffusion and growth processes have been studied intensely in the past few years in relation to many areas such as sociology, economics and engineering. Among the models studied are *stochastic cellular automata* (see, for example [48], [26], [25]), *the voter model* which was first introduced by Clifford and Sudbury in [13] and has been much studied since in, for example, [33], [10], [19], *the contact process* (see, for example, [27]), *the stochastic Ising model* (see [24], [11]), and *the influence model* (see [1]).

Recently, a strong motivation for analyzing diffusion processes has emanated from the study of viral marketing strategies in data mining (see, for example, [18], [45], [37], [38]). In this model

one takes into account the “network value” of potential customers, that is, it seeks to target a set of individuals whose influence on the social network through word-of-mouth effects is high. For a given diffusion process, we define the influence maximization problem. For each initial set of active nodes S , we define $\sigma(S)$ to be the expected size of the set of active nodes at the end of the process. In the influence maximization problem, we aim to find a set S of fixed size that maximizes $\sigma(S)$. In attempts to find a set of influential individuals, heuristic approaches such as picking individuals of high degree or picking individuals with short average distance to the rest of the network have been commonly used, typically with no theoretic guarantees (see [47]). In [37] it was shown that the influence maximization problem is NP-hard to approximate within a factor of $1 - \frac{1}{e} + \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. On the other hand, in [38] it was shown that under the assumption that the function σ is *submodular*, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is possible to find a set S of fixed size that is a $(1 - \frac{1}{e} - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the maximum in random polynomial time. In [44] it was proven that the function σ is indeed submodular.

As mentioned earlier the paper [7] defines the competitive influence maximization problem on general graphs. We believe that an interesting research direction is to show that for random d -regular graphs, the payoffs of the two players at each Nash Equilibria are essentially the same as the payoff obtained by playing according to random strategies.

1.5 Acknowledgments

E.M. is supported by DMS 0548249 (CAREER) award, by DOD ONR grant N000141110140, by ISF grant 1300/08 and by a Minerva Grant.

2 The random d -regular graph

When studying d -regular graphs it is often useful to consider the *configuration model*. The *configuration model* was introduced by Bollobás in [8]. This model is used to construct a uniform random d -regular graph on N vertices. In this model we view each vertex of the graph as a set of d *half-edges*. We then pick a uniform perfect matching on these dN half-edges, and contract each d -tuple of half-edges back to a single vertex. It is shown in [8] that with probability that tends to $e^{\frac{1-d^2}{4}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, this process yields a simple d -regular graph. Moreover, conditioning on the event that the graph is simple, it is uniformly distributed among all simple d -regular graphs on N vertices.

The uniform perfect matching can be picked by picking its edges sequentially, therefore we can simulate our model by the following process: We start with dN half-edges. Each half-edge can be in one of four states: *uncolored*, *blue*, *red* or *explored*. In the initial state we have a set $\mathcal{X}_0$ of X_0 *blue* half-edges, a set $\mathcal{Y}_0$ of Y_0 *red* half-edges and a set $\mathcal{Z}_0$ of Z_0 *uncolored* half-edges. The number of *explored* half-edges is $dN - X_0 - Y_0 - Z_0$. In step n , we randomly pick a half-edge e_n from $\mathcal{X}_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{Y}_{n-1}$, where half-edges in $\mathcal{X}_{n-1}$ have weight β and half-edges in $\mathcal{Y}_{n-1}$ have weight 1. We change the status of e_n to *explored*. We then uniformly pick another half-edge g_n from $\mathcal{X}_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{Y}_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_{n-1} \setminus \{e_n\}$. If g_n is *uncolored*, we change its status to be *explored*, and change the status of $d - 1$ of the remaining *uncolored* half-edges to the same color that e_n was before its status became *explored*. If g_n is either *blue* or *red*, we just change its status to *explored*. We denote the size of $\mathcal{X}_n$ ($\mathcal{Y}_n$) by X_n (Y_n). The process ends when there are no more *blue* or *red* half-edges. If we have k_1 independent rate β exponential random variables $I_1, \dots, I_{k_1}$, and

k_2 independent rate 1 exponential random variables $I_{k_1+1}, \dots, I_{k_1+k_2}$, then the random variable $J = \operatorname{argmin}\{I_1, \dots, I_{k_1+k_2}\}$ is distributed among $1, \dots, k_1 + k_2$ the same way as the half-edges e_n is distributed when $X_{n-1} = k_1$ and $Y_{n-1} = k_2$. Therefore, conditioned on the graph being simple, the process described here corresponds to the discrete competing infection process on a random regular graph with independent exponential rate β random variables on edges with a *blue* end and exponential rate 1 random variables on edges with a *red* end. However, at the end of this process there are no more *blue* or *red* half-edges, and since the quantity that we are interested in is the number of *blue vertices* at the end of the process, we need to keep track of the number of times the edges e_n and g_n were picked *blue* and *uncolored* respectively. We will denote $M = X_0 + Y_0 + Z_0$.

In the text we also need some results on the finite Pólya urns. A Pólya urn is an urn containing balls of up to k different colors. The urn evolves according to the following Markov process. At each time $n \geq 1$, one ball is drawn at random from the urn, and its color is observed. If the color of the ball is i , then for each $j = 1, \dots, k$ we place A_{ij} balls of color j in the urn. Generally speaking, A_{ij} can be positive or negative, or even random.

Our result concerns only urns containing two colors - *red* and *blue*, so from now on we assume that $k = 2$. An urn scheme is usually represented by its replacement matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

the rows of which are indexed by the color of the ball picked, and the columns are indexed by the color of the balls added. We denote the number of balls of each color at step n by S_n and Z_n . To learn more about different types of Pólya urn models, see, for example [42].

To relevance of the urn models is revealed if we observe that the the process $(X_n + Y_n - 1, Z_n)$ is exactly the Pólya urn process with the replacement matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ d-2 & -d \end{pmatrix}.$$

The following is then a simple corollary of Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 2.1. *Consider the process started with X_0 blue and Y_0 red half-edges and $Z_0 = M - X_0 - Y_0$ uncolored half-edges. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have that the events*

$$\left\{ \left| \frac{Z_n}{Z_0(1 - 2n/M)^{d/2}} - 1 \right| \leq \epsilon, \text{ for all } 0 \leq n \leq (M - M^{1-2/d} \log M)/2, \right\}$$

and

$$\left\{ \left| \frac{X_n + Y_n}{(M - 2n) - Z_0(1 - 2n/M)^{d/2}} - 1 \right| \leq \epsilon, \text{ for all } 0 \leq n < M/2 \right\}$$

have probabilities converging to 1, uniformly in Z_0 , as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

2.1 Proofs

Thm. 1.1 and Thm. 1.2 both follow from the next theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Let (L_M) be a sequence converging to ∞ , and assume that $X_0 \wedge Y_0 \geq L_M$ and $Z_0 \geq M/L_M$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ asymptotically almost surely (as $M \rightarrow \infty$) we have*

$$\frac{\bar{R} - R_0}{N - R_0 - B_0} = (1 \pm o(1)) \frac{Y_0}{X_0 + Y_0}, \text{ for } \beta = 1, \quad (1)$$

and

$$\frac{\bar{R} - R_0}{N - R_0 - B_0} = (1 \pm o(1)) \int_0^1 \phi_\beta^{-1} \left(\frac{MX_0^{1/(\beta-1)}}{Y_0^{\beta/(\beta-1)}} \left(t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \right) \right) dt, \text{ when } \beta \neq 1, \quad (2)$$

where $\phi_\beta: (0, 1) \rightarrow \infty$ is a one-to-one function defined as $\phi(s) = \frac{(1-s)^{1/(\beta-1)}}{s^{\beta/(\beta-1)}}$. In particular there are constants c and C such that asymptotically almost surely (as $M \rightarrow \infty$)

$$c \frac{Y_0}{M} \left(\frac{M}{X_0} \right)^{1/\beta} \wedge c \leq \frac{\bar{R} - R_0}{N - R_0 - B_0} \leq C \frac{Y_0}{M} \left(\frac{M}{X_0} \right)^{1/\beta} \wedge 1. \quad (3)$$

Convergence in all limits depends only on the values of β , d and the sequence (L_M) .

In order to prove Thm. 2.2, we define the following random process that will be used throughout the proofs.

$$K_n = \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}}. \quad (4)$$

The proof of Thm. 2.2 is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let β be any positive real number. Let (L_M) be a sequence of positive numbers converging to ∞ and such that $\lim_M L_M M^{-\gamma} = 0$, for any $\gamma > 0$. Assume that $L_M^{\frac{(1+\beta)^4}{\beta^2}} \leq X_0 \leq Y_0$. Define n_0 as the largest integer such that*

$$M - 2n_0 \geq L_M \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{K_0} \vee \frac{K_0}{M^{(1-\beta)/2}} \right)^{2/(1+\beta)}.$$

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a sequence of numbers η_M converging to zero and a constant C such that with probability of at least $1 - \eta_M$ both of the following holds

i) $|K_n/K_0 - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq n \leq n_0$,

ii) $X_n \leq CL_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}}$ for all $n \geq n_0$ in the case $K_0 \leq M^{(1-\beta)/2}$, and $Y_n \leq CL_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}}$ for all $n \geq n_0$ in the case $K_0 \geq M^{(1-\beta)/2}$.

Remark 2.1. *The choice of the exponent $\frac{(1+\beta)^4}{\beta^2}$ in the lower bound for X_0 is just a technical condition. Actually given X_0 one can always decrease the value of L_M so that the inequality in the statement holds. Nevertheless the assumption that $Y_0 \geq L_M^{(1+\beta)^4/\beta^2}$ and $X_0 \geq L_M^{(1+\beta)^4/\beta^2}$ implies that*

$$L_M^{(1+\beta)^4/\beta^2} M^{-\beta} \leq K_0 \leq M L_M^{-(1+\beta)^4/\beta}$$

and

$$M - 2n_0 \leq L_M^{1-2(1+\beta)^3/\beta} M \vee L_M^{1-2(1+\beta)^3/\beta^2} M. \quad (5)$$

In particular we know that $1 - 2n_0/M$ is converging to 0, a fact which will be useful in our proofs.

The proof of Lemma 2.3 is based on the following lemma and its corollary.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/2$. For a positive real number c assume that the condition*

$$\frac{K_k}{M^{(1-\beta)/2}} \leq c(M-2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1-2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1-\beta} \quad (6)$$

is satisfied for $k = 0$ and define the stopping time τ as the smallest positive integer k for which (6) is not satisfied. Then there exists a sequence (δ_M) converging to 0 and depending only on M , and a constant C depending only on β , d and c such that for any positive integer n

$$\mathbb{P}(|K_{k \wedge \tau} - K_0| \geq \varepsilon K_0, \text{ for some } 0 \leq k \leq n) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M-2n)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right) + \delta_M, \quad (7)$$

whenever

$$\varepsilon \geq C \left(\frac{1}{M-2n} + \frac{1}{X_0 + Y_0} \right). \quad (8)$$

Corollary 2.5. *Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/2$. Assume that for a positive real number C_0 and an integer n the inequality*

$$\frac{K_0}{M^{(1-\beta)/2}} \leq C_0(M-2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1-2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1-\beta}$$

is satisfied for $0 \leq k \leq n$. Then there exists a sequence (δ_M) converging to 0 and depending only on M , and a constant C , depending on β , d and C_0 , such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|K_k - K_0| \geq \varepsilon K_0, \text{ for some } 0 \leq k \leq n) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M-2n)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right) + \delta_M, \quad (9)$$

whenever

$$\varepsilon \geq C \left(\frac{1}{M-2n} + \frac{1}{X_0 + Y_0} \right).$$

Proof. Define stopping time τ as the smallest integer k such that

$$\frac{K_k}{M^{(1-\beta)/2}} > 2C_0(M-2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1-2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1-\beta}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.4 we conclude that the event

$$|K_{k \wedge \tau} - K_0| \leq \varepsilon K_0, \text{ for all } 0 \leq k \leq n, \quad (10)$$

has probability of at least

$$1 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M-2n)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right) - \delta_M,$$

for an appropriately chosen constant C . Since $\tau < n$ implies $K_\tau > 2K_0$, on the event in (10) we have that $\tau \geq n$. Thus in the event in (10) we can replace $K_{k \wedge \tau}$ by K_k which completes the proof. $\square$

In order to prove Lemma 2.4, we first prove two lemmas. The first is a general lemma bounding the conditional expectation and variance of the differences in a general random process.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $(K_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a positive process such that K_0 is a constant, and p_n and r_n positive real numbers defined for $n \geq 0$, such that*

$$|\mathbb{E}(K_{n+1} - K_n | \mathcal{F}_n)| \leq p_n K_n, \text{ and } \mathbb{E}((K_{n+1} - K_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq r_n K_n.$$

Consider the process $I_0 = K_0$, $I_n = K_n - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}(K_{k+1} - K_k | \mathcal{F}_k)$. Then process I_n is a martingale and for every positive integer n we have

$$|K_n - I_n| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k q_{k+1, n-1} I_k, \text{ and } \mathbb{E}((I_n - I_0)^2) \leq K_0 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} r_k q_{0, k-1},$$

where $q_{\ell, k} = \prod_{i=\ell}^k (1 + p_i)$ for $\ell \leq k$ and $q_{k, k-1} = 1$, for all $k \geq 0$.

Proof. It is trivial to check that the process I_n is a martingale. Furthermore it can be shown by induction that for every $k \leq n$

$$q_{k, n} - 1 = \sum_{\ell=k}^n p_\ell q_{\ell+1, n} = \sum_{\ell=k}^n p_\ell q_{k, \ell-1}. \quad (11)$$

Using the first inequality in the statement we have that

$$|K_n - I_n| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k K_k. \quad (12)$$

In particular we have

$$K_n - I_n \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k K_k = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k (K_k - I_k) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k I_k. \quad (13)$$

Using (13) inductively we can show that $K_n - I_n \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_{n, k} I_k$ whenever the sequence $(a_{n, k})_{0 \leq k < n}$ satisfies $a_{n, n-1} = p_{n-1}$ and $a_{n, k} = \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{n-1} p_\ell a_{\ell, k} + p_k$. Using (11) it is easy to check that $a_{n, k} = p_k q_{k+1, n-1}$ satisfies these conditions. Thus we have

$$K_n \leq I_n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k q_{k+1, n-1} I_k. \quad (14)$$

Plugging this back into (12) and using (11) we get

$$|K_n - I_n| \leq p_{n-1} I_{n-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} p_k \left(1 + \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{n-1} p_\ell q_{k+1, \ell-1} \right) I_k = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k q_{k+1, n-1} I_k,$$

which proves the first claim.

Note that (14) and (11) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}(K_n) \leq \left(1 + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k q_{k+1, n-1} \right) I_0 = q_{0, n-1} K_0. \quad (15)$$

Thus the condition in the statement implies that

$$\mathbb{E}((K_{n+1} - K_n)^2) \leq r_n \mathbb{E}(K_n) \leq r_n q_{0,n-1} K_0.$$

It is easy to check that $\mathbb{E}((I_{n+1} - I_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq \mathbb{E}((K_{n+1} - K_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n)$ which then yields

$$\mathbb{E}((I_n - I_0)^2) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}((I_{k+1} - I_k)^2) \leq K_0 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} r_k q_{0,k-1}.$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

The second lemma we prove in order to prove Lemma 2.4 bounds the conditional expectation and variance of $K_n - K_{n-1}$ where K_n is defined in (4).

Lemma 2.7. *For the process K_n as defined in (4), there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on β and d , such that for all integers n , on the event that $Y_n \geq 2d$ we have both*

$$|\mathbb{E}(K_{n+1} - K_n | \mathcal{F}_n)| \leq \frac{CK_n}{Y_n(X_n + Y_n)}, \quad (16)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}((K_{n+1} - K_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq \frac{CK_n}{Y_n^{1+\beta}(1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Throughout the proof we assume that $M - 2n \geq Y_n \geq 2d$. To prove (16) we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{2n+2}{M}\right)^{(1-\beta)/2} (\beta X_n + Y_n)(M - 2n - 1) \mathbb{E}(K_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) = \\ \frac{X_n + d - 2}{Y_n^\beta} \beta X_n (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n) + \frac{X_n}{(Y_n + d - 2)^\beta} Y_n (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n) \\ + \frac{X_n - 2}{Y_n^\beta} \beta X_n (X_n - 1) + \frac{X_n - 1}{(Y_n - 1)^\beta} (1 + \beta) X_n Y_n + \frac{X_n}{(Y_n - 2)^\beta} Y_n (Y_n - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It can be easily verified that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{2n+2}{M}\right)^{(1-\beta)/2} (\beta X_n + Y_n)(M - 2n - 1) K_n = \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta} (\beta X_n + Y_n) \left(1 - \frac{2}{M - 2n}\right)^{(1-\beta)/2} (M - 2n - 1) \\ = \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta} (\beta X_n + Y_n) (M - 2n - 2 + \beta + O((M - 2n)^{-1})), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the absolute value of the term $O((M - 2n)^{-1})$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $(M - 2n)^{-1}$. To prove (16) it is enough to show that the absolute value of the difference of the terms in (18) and (19) is bounded by

$$\frac{CX_n(M - 2n)}{Y_n^{\beta+1}} \quad (20)$$

for some constant C . First note that, since $X_n + Y_n \leq M - 2n$, the expression

$$X_n Y_n^{-\beta} (\beta X_n + Y_n) (M - 2n)^{-1}$$

is bounded by (20), for some $C > 0$. Thus we can disregard the term $O((M - 2n)^{-1})$ in (19).

By Taylor expansion we know that for any compact interval containing 1 there is a constant C_1 such that for all t in this interval

$$\left| 1 - \beta t - \frac{1}{(1+t)^\beta} \right| \leq \frac{C_1 t^2}{(1+t)^\beta}$$

(actually by a slightly more careful argument one can argue that C_1 does not depend on the interval). Now fix any $k \geq -2$ and choose $t = kY_n^{-1}$ and a constant C_1 to obtain

$$\left| \frac{1}{Y_n^\beta} \left(1 - \frac{k\beta}{Y_n} \right) - \frac{1}{(Y_n + k)^\beta} \right| \leq \frac{C_1 k^2}{(Y_n + k)^\beta Y_n^2}.$$

For $k = d - 2$ this in particular implies that

$$\left| X_n Y_n^{1-\beta} (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n) \left(1 - \frac{\beta(d-2)}{Y_n} \right) - \frac{X_n Y_n (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n)}{(Y_n + d - 2)^\beta} \right| \leq \frac{C_2 X_n (M - 2n)}{Y_n^{\beta+1}},$$

for a constant $C_2 = (d-2)^2 C_1$. Therefore we can replace the term $\frac{X_n}{(Y_n + d - 2)^\beta} Y_n (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n)$ on the right hand side of (18) by $X_n Y_n^{-\beta} (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n) (Y_n - \beta(d-2))$. Arguing similarly we see that we can replace the terms $\frac{X_n - 1}{(Y_n - 1)^\beta} (1 + \beta) X_n Y_n$ and $\frac{X_n}{(Y_n - 2)^\beta} Y_n (Y_n - 1)$ on the right hand side of (18) by $\frac{X_n - 1}{Y_n^\beta} (1 + \beta) X_n (Y_n + \beta)$ and $\frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta} (Y_n - 1) (Y_n + 2\beta)$ respectively. Therefore it is enough to prove

$$\begin{aligned} & (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n) \left(\frac{X_n + d - 2}{Y_n^\beta} \beta X_n + \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta} (Y_n - \beta(d-2)) - \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta} (\beta X_n + Y_n) \right) \\ & + \frac{X_n - 2}{Y_n^\beta} \beta X_n (X_n - 1) + \frac{X_n - 1}{Y_n^\beta} (1 + \beta) X_n (Y_n + \beta) + \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta} (Y_n - 1) (Y_n + 2\beta) \\ & - \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta} (\beta X_n + Y_n) (X_n + Y_n - 2 + \beta) \leq \frac{C X_n (M - 2n)}{Y_n^{\beta+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

for a large enough constant C . Expanding the expressions in the left hand side above we see that it is equal to $\beta(\beta + 1) X_n Y_n^{-\beta}$. This proves the claim.

Now we prove (17). First note that it is enough to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}((K_{n+1} - K_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq \frac{C K_n^2}{X_n Y_n}. \quad (21)$$

Analyzing all the cases we see that the value of $|K_{n+1} - K_n|$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{X_n + d - 2}{Y_n^\beta (1 - (2n + 2)/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} - \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} \right| \leq C_1 K_n \left(\frac{1}{X_n} + \frac{1}{M - 2n} \right), \\ & \left| \frac{X_n}{(Y_n + d - 2)^\beta (1 - (2n + 2)/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} - \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} \right| \leq C_2 K_n \left(\frac{1}{Y_n} + \frac{1}{M - 2n} \right), \\ & \left| \frac{X_n - 2}{Y_n^\beta (1 - (2n + 2)/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} - \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} \right| \leq C_3 K_n \left(\frac{1}{X_n} + \frac{1}{M - 2n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\left| \frac{X_n - 1}{(Y_n - 1)^\beta (1 - (2n + 2)/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} - \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} \right| \leq C_4 K_n \left(\frac{1}{X_n} + \frac{1}{Y_n} + \frac{1}{M - 2n} \right),$$

or

$$\left| \frac{X_n}{(Y_n - 2)^\beta (1 - (2n + 2)/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} - \frac{X_n}{Y_n^\beta (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2}} \right| \leq C_5 K_n \left(\frac{1}{Y_n} + \frac{1}{M - 2n} \right),$$

with probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta X_n (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n)}{(\beta X_n + Y_n)(M - 2n - 1)}, \quad \frac{Y_n (M - 2n - X_n - Y_n)}{(\beta X_n + Y_n)(M - 2n - 1)}, \quad \frac{\beta X_n (X_n - 1)}{(\beta X_n + Y_n)(M - 2n - 1)}, \\ & \frac{(1 + \beta) X_n Y_n}{(\beta X_n + Y_n)(M - 2n - 1)}, \quad \frac{Y_n (Y_n - 1)}{(\beta X_n + Y_n)(M - 2n - 1)}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Here C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 and C_5 are constants depending only on β and d . Therefore for a large constant C_0 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}((K_{n+1} - K_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) & \leq C_0 K_n^2 \left(\frac{1}{(M - 2n)^2} + \frac{1}{X_n^2} \frac{X_n}{\beta X_n + Y_n} + \frac{1}{Y_n^2} \frac{Y_n}{\beta X_n + Y_n} \right) \\ & \leq C_0 K_n^2 \left(\frac{1}{(M - 2n)^2} + \frac{X_n + Y_n}{X_n Y_n (\beta X_n + Y_n)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with the fact $X_n Y_n \leq (M - 2n)^2$, yields (21) . □

We now go back to proving Lemma 2.4.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. We begin by showing that for any $C_0 > 0$ we can choose C so that (8) implies

$$\left(1 - \frac{2k}{M}\right) \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} \left(1 - \frac{2k}{M}\right)^{d/2-1}\right) \geq \frac{C_0}{M\varepsilon}, \quad (22)$$

for all $0 \leq k \leq n$. Since the function $\phi(t) = t - t^{d/2} Z_0/M$ is concave on $[0, 1]$ the minimum of the left hand side in (22) is either

$$\phi(1 - 2n/M) \geq (1 - 2n/M) - (1 - 2n/M)^{d/2}, \quad \text{or} \quad \phi(1) = (M - Z_0)/M = (X_0 + Y_0)/M.$$

Clearly both of these values are bounded from below by the right hand side of (22) when the constant C is chosen to be large enough.

Now define σ as the first time k that

$$X_k + Y_k \leq \frac{M - 2k}{2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right) \text{ or } Y_k \leq 2d,$$

and define the process $K'_k = K_{k \wedge \tau \wedge \sigma}$. Since σ and τ are stopping times with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_k$, the process K'_k is adapted to this filtration.

Next we show that there is a positive constant c_1 such that for all $k < \sigma \wedge \tau$ we have

$$Y_k \geq c_1 (M - 2k) \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right). \quad (23)$$

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that for some $k < \sigma \wedge \tau$ we have

$$Y_k < c_1(M - 2k) \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right).$$

Then since $k < \tau$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_k &\leq Y_k^\beta (M - 2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} c(M - 2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1-\beta} \\ &< cc_1^\beta (M - 2k) \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $k < \sigma$ we have $X_k + Y_k > \frac{M-2k}{2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)$ which implies $cc_1^\beta + c_1 \geq 1/2$. When c_1 is small enough we obtain a contradiction and prove (23). Lemma 2.7 now implies that for all $0 \leq k \leq n$

$$|\mathbb{E}(K'_{k+1} - K'_k | \mathcal{F}_k)| \leq \frac{C_1 K'_k}{(M - 2k)^2 \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^2}, \quad (24)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(K'_{k+1} - K'_k | \mathcal{F}_k)^2 \leq \frac{C_1 M^{(1-\beta)/2} K'_k}{(M - 2k)^{(3+\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1+\beta}}, \quad (25)$$

for some constant C_1 depending only on β , d and c . Define

$$p_k = \frac{C_1}{(M - 2k)^2 \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^2}.$$

First we bound $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k$ by a multiple of ε . To this end observe that for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$

$$t^{d/2-1} \leq (t+1)/2. \quad (26)$$

Next calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k &= \frac{C_1}{M^2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{(1 - 2k/M)^2 \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^2} + \frac{M^2}{(X_0 + Y_0)^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C_1}{2M} \left(\int_{1-2n/M}^1 \frac{dt}{t^2 \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{d/2-1}\right)^2} + \frac{2M}{(X_0 + Y_0)^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Here we use the fact that $t \mapsto (t - \lambda t^{d/2})^{-2}$ is a convex function. To estimate the above integral

we use (26) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{1-2n/M}^1 \frac{dt}{t^2 \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{d/2-1}\right)^2} &= \int_{(1-2n/M) \wedge 1/2}^{1/2} \frac{dt}{t^2 \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{d/2-1}\right)^2} + \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{dt}{t^2 \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{d/2-1}\right)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(1 - 2^{-d/2+1})^2} \int_{(1-2n/M) \wedge 1/2}^{1/2} \frac{dt}{t^2} + 4 \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{dt}{\left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} + \frac{Z_0}{2M}(1-t)\right)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{C_2 M}{M - 2n} + \frac{C_2 M}{Z_0} \int_{1-Z_0/M}^1 \frac{ds}{s^2} \\
&\leq \frac{C_2 M}{M - 2n} + \frac{C_2 M}{M - Z_0},
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C_2 depending only on β , d and c . For the above calculations we need to assume that $Z_0 > 0$, but note that the upper bound in the last line also holds for $Z_0 = 0$. Combining this with (27) and (8) yields $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k \leq \varepsilon/3$, for a large enough constant C . Defining $q_{k,l} = \prod_{i=k}^l (1+p_i)$ as in Lemma 2.6 we have for all $1 \leq k \leq \ell \leq n-1$

$$q_{k,\ell} \leq e^{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k} \leq e^{\varepsilon/3} \leq \frac{3}{2}. \quad (28)$$

Now define the martingale $I_0 = K'_0$, $I_k = K'_k - \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}(K'_{\ell+1} - K'_\ell | \mathcal{F}_\ell)$ as in Lemma 2.6, which together with (28) implies

$$|K'_k - I_k| \leq \frac{3}{2} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} p_\ell I_\ell. \quad (29)$$

Lemma 2.6 and (25) now yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}((I_n - I_0)^2) &\leq \frac{3C_1 I_0}{2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M - 2k)^{(3+\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} \left(1 - 2k/M\right)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1+\beta}} + \frac{1}{(X_0 + Y_0)^{1+\beta}} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{3C_1 I_0}{4M^\beta} \int_{1-2n/M}^1 \frac{dt}{t^{(3+\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{d/2-1}\right)^{1+\beta}} + \frac{3C_1 I_0}{2(X_0 + Y_0)^{1+\beta}}.
\end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The second inequality above follows from the fact that the function

$$\phi(t) = t^{-(3+\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{d/2-1}\right)^{-1-\beta}$$

is either decreasing on $[0, 1]$ or decreasing on an interval $(0, t_0)$ and increasing on $(t_0, 1)$ for some $0 < t_0 < 1$. This is clear from the calculation of the first derivative

$$\phi'(t) = t^{-(\beta+5)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-2)/2}\right)^{-(\beta+2)} \left(\left(\beta + 3 + \frac{(d-2)(\beta+1)}{2} \right) \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-2)/2} - (\beta+3) \right).$$

The integral in (30) can be estimated like the one in (27):

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{1-2n/M}^1 \frac{dt}{t^{(3+\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{d/2-1}\right)^{1+\beta}} &\leq (1 - 2^{1-d/2})^{-1-\beta} \int_{(1-2n/M) \wedge 1/2}^{1/2} \frac{dt}{t^{(3+\beta)/2}} \\
&+ 2^{(3+\beta)/2} \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{dt}{\left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} + \frac{Z_0}{2M}(1-t)\right)^{1+\beta}} \leq C_4 \left(\left(\frac{M}{M-2n}\right)^{(1+\beta)/2} + \frac{M}{Z_0} \int_{1-Z_0/M}^1 \frac{ds}{s^{1+\beta}} \right) \\
&\leq C_4 \left(\frac{M^{(1+\beta)/2}}{(M-2n)^{(1+\beta)/2}} + \frac{M}{\beta Z_0} \left(\left(\frac{M}{M-Z_0}\right)^\beta - 1 \right) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where C_4 is a constant depending only on β and d . To bound the last term on the last line above observe that for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$ we have $(1-t)^\beta \geq 1-t$ for $\beta \leq 1$ and $(1-t)^\beta \geq 1-\beta t$ for $\beta > 1$, which yields $((1-t)^{-\beta} - 1)t^{-1} \leq (1 \wedge \beta)(1-t)^{-\beta}$, for all $0 \leq t < 1$. This applied to $t = Z_0/M$ and combined with (30) and Doob's maximal inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|I_k - I_0| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} I_0, \text{ for some } 0 \leq k \leq n) &\leq \frac{27C_1 C_4 Y_0^\beta}{2\varepsilon^2 X_0 M^\beta} \left(\frac{M^{(1+\beta)/2}}{(M-2n)^{(1+\beta)/2}} + (1 \wedge \beta) \left(\frac{M}{M-Z_0}\right)^\beta \right) + \frac{27C_1 Y_0^\beta}{\varepsilon^2 X_0 (X_0 + Y_0)^{1+\beta}} \\
&\leq \frac{C_5}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M-2n)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Again for all the above calculations we need $Z_0 > 0$, but one can observe that the upper bound in the last line holds even if $Z_0 = 0$. If $|I_k - I_0| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} I_0$, for all $0 \leq k \leq n$, then (29) and the inequality $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k \leq \varepsilon/3$ imply

$$|K'_k - K'_0| \leq |K'_k - I_k| + |I_k - I_0| \leq \frac{3}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\right) I_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} I_0 \leq \varepsilon K_0.$$

Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|K'_k - K'_0| \geq \varepsilon K_0, \text{ for some } 0 \leq k \leq n) \leq \frac{C_5}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M-2n)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right).$$

Define $1 - \delta_M$ to be the probability that

$$X_k + Y_k \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(M - 2k - Z_0(1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1} \right)$$

holds for all $0 \leq k \leq n$. By Theorem 4.1 we have that $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \delta_M = 0$. Since $K'_k = K_{k \wedge \tau}$ for $k \leq \sigma \wedge n$ it is enough to show that $\mathbb{P}(\sigma < \tau \wedge n) \leq \delta_M$. To this end simply observe that on the event above, inequality (23) and $\sigma < \tau \wedge n$ imply

$$c_1(M - 2k) \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right) \leq Y_k \leq 2d + 2,$$

for $k = \sigma - 1$. However, by (22) and the fact that $\varepsilon \leq 1/2$, this is impossible for C large enough in (8) (recall that the value of c_1 depended only on c and β). $\square$

Remark 2.2. A more careful analysis of the process K_n would allow one to replace Doob's maximal inequality with Freedman's inequality (see [22]), and obtain exponential bound in the statement of Lemma 2.4. However the bound above suffices to our purposes and, to avoid even more tedious analysis, we use Doob's maximal inequality.

Remark 2.3. Starting in the proof of Lemma 2.3 and further we will use the following simple fact. Let L_n be any process adapted to a filtration $\mathcal{F}_n$. Assume that for any ϵ we have a sequence of events $(\Omega_{M,\epsilon})$ of events such that $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{M,\epsilon}) \rightarrow 1$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and such that on the event $\Omega_{M,\epsilon}$ we have $p_M(n) - \epsilon \leq \mathbb{P}(L_{n+1} - L_n \in A | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq p_M(n) + \epsilon$. Then the number of indices $1 \leq n \leq N(M) \rightarrow \infty$ such that $L_{n+1} - L_n \in A$ is on $\Omega_{M,\epsilon}$ stochastically bounded from above (below) by a sum of $N(M)$ independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters $p_M(n) + \epsilon$ ($p_M(n) - \epsilon$). In particular, if $N(M) \rightarrow \infty$ then by Hoeffding's inequality (see [30]), the number of such indices is equal to $1 + o(1)$ times $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N(M)} p(n)$.

We are now ready to prove Lemma 2.3.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Throughout the proof we assume that M is sufficiently large for the estimates to hold. We can assume $\varepsilon < 1/2$ and $\eta_M \geq C' L_M^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1}$, for any constant C' (at different stages in the proof we choose convenient values for C'). Since we can also assume that $\eta_M < 1$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove), we can assume that

$$\varepsilon \geq \frac{C'}{L_M}. \quad (31)$$

We start by defining the function $f(t) = \sqrt{t} - Z_0 t^{(d-1)/2} / M$. Recalling Theorem 4.1 we know that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a sequence (δ_M) converging to 0 such that with probability of at least $1 - \delta_M$ we have that for every $0 \leq n \leq \frac{M}{2} - 1$

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{X_n + Y_n}{M - 2n - Z_0(1 - 2n/M)^{d/2}} = \frac{X_n + Y_n}{f(1 - 2n/M) \sqrt{M(M - 2n)}} \leq 1 + \varepsilon. \quad (32)$$

Using the fact that $X_n + Y_n = M - 2n - Z_n$ the above inequalities can be rewritten as

$$(1 + \varepsilon) \frac{Z_0}{M} \left(1 - \frac{2n}{M}\right)^{d/2-1} - \varepsilon \leq \frac{Z_n}{M - 2n} \leq \varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{Z_0}{M} \left(1 - \frac{2n}{M}\right)^{d/2-1},$$

which in turn implies that

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1 - \frac{Z_n}{M-2n} \left(1 - \frac{2k}{M-2n}\right)^{d/2-1}}{1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} \left(1 - \frac{2(n+k)}{M}\right)^{d/2-1}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \quad (33)$$

whenever $M - 2n - 2k > 1$. Furthermore (32) also implies that for every $0 \leq n \leq n_0$

$$X_n + Y_n \geq L_M/3. \quad (34)$$

To check (34), by (32) it is enough to check that $\phi(t) \geq \frac{2L_M}{3M}$ for $1 - 2n_0/M \leq t \leq 1$, where $\phi(t) = t - t^{d/2} Z_0 / M$. By the concavity of ϕ and the fact that $M - 2n_0 \geq L_M$ it is enough to check the lower bound for $t = L_M/M$ and $t = 1$ for which the claim is obvious. The fact that (33) and

(34) hold with probability at least $1 - \delta_M$, where (δ_M) is a sequence converging to 0, enables us to assume these inequalities to hold throughout the proof.

First we present the bound for the event in *i*) for the simplest case when $\beta = 1$. Because $X_0 \leq Y_0$ we have $K_0 \leq 1$ and in this case n_0 is the largest integer with the property that $M - 2n_0 \geq L_M/K_0$. By Corollary 2.5 applied with $C_0 = 1$ we have that with probability at least

$$1 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{1}{(M - 2n_0)K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right) - \delta_M \geq 1 - \frac{2C}{\varepsilon^2 L_M} - \delta_M,$$

we have

$$|K_k - K_0| \leq \varepsilon K_0, \text{ for all } 0 \leq k \leq n_0,$$

which proves the claim for *i*) when $\beta = 1$.

Next we analyze the probability of the event in *i*) for $\beta \neq 1$. We start by showing that for any constant $c > 1$ there exists $0 < c' < 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c} f(1 - 2k/M) \leq \frac{K_k^{1/(1-\beta)}}{M} \leq c f(1 - 2k/M) \Rightarrow X_k \wedge Y_k \geq c'(X_k + Y_k). \quad (35)$$

If $X_k < c'(X_k + Y_k)$ then $Y_k > (1 - c')(X_k + Y_k)$ and

$$\frac{K_k^{1/(1-\beta)}}{M} = \left(\frac{X_k}{Y_k^\beta} \right)^{1/(1-\beta)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M(M - 2k)}} \leq \frac{c'^{1/(1-\beta)}}{(1 - c')^{\beta/(1-\beta)}} \frac{X_k + Y_k}{\sqrt{M(M - 2k)}},$$

where the inequality in $\leq$ is $<$ for $\beta < 1$ and $>$ for $\beta > 1$. Using (32) to bound the term $(X_k + Y_k)(M(M - 2k))^{-1/2}$ we obtain a contradiction with the left hand side of (35) for c' such that $c'(1 - c')^{-\beta} \leq (c/(1 - \varepsilon))^{-|1-\beta|}$, which yields $X_k \geq c'(X_k + Y_k)$. In the same way one can show that $Y_k \geq c'(X_k + Y_k)$ for an appropriately chosen c' .

Now fix numbers $0 < c_2 < 1$ and $c_1 > 2$. We show that when $\beta < 1$

$$\frac{K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}}{M} < \frac{X_0 + Y_0}{M} = f(1), \quad (36)$$

and when $\beta > 1$

$$c_1 \frac{K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}}{M} > \frac{X_0 + Y_0}{M} = f(1). \quad (37)$$

To prove (36) simply observe that it is equivalent to $X_0 Y_0^{-\beta} < (X_0 + Y_0)^{1-\beta}$ and to

$$\frac{X_0}{X_0 + Y_0} < \left(\frac{Y_0}{X_0 + Y_0} \right)^\beta,$$

which, because of $X_0 \leq Y_0$ surely holds for $\beta < 1$. Inequality (37) is similarly equivalent to

$$\frac{X_0}{X_0 + Y_0} < c_1^{\beta-1} \left(\frac{Y_0}{X_0 + Y_0} \right)^\beta,$$

which again holds, by the assumption that $c_1 > 2$ and $X_0 \leq Y_0$.

Note that f is a concave nonnegative function on $[0, 1]$ and $f(0) = 0$. By (36) if $\beta < 1$ there is a unique point $0 < t_2 < 1$ such that $f(t_2) = c_2 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M$. If $\beta > 1$ then in the case when

$\max_{[0,1]} f \geq c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M$ denote by t_2 the smallest element in $f^{-1}(c_2 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M)$ and by t_1 the largest element in $f^{-1}(c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M)$. Define $\bar{n}_1$ as the largest integer such that $M - 2\bar{n}_1 \geq Mt_1$, and $\bar{n}_2$ the largest integer such that $M - 2\bar{n}_2 \geq t_2 M$. Furthermore, define $n_1 = \bar{n}_1 \wedge n_0$ and $n_2 = \bar{n}_2 \wedge n_0$.

Next we prove that

$$c_2 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M \leq f(1 - 2n_i/M) \leq c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M, \quad (38)$$

whenever $n_i < n_0$, for $i = 1, 2$. Since $c_1 - c_2 \geq 1$ we only need to prove that $|f'(t)| \leq K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}$ whenever

$$t > \frac{M - 2n_0 - 2}{M}, \text{ and } c_2 \frac{K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}}{M} \leq f(t) \leq c_1 \frac{K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}}{M}. \quad (39)$$

Since $M - 2n_0 \geq L_M$ the condition $t > (M - 2n_0 - 2)/M$ implies $t \geq \frac{L_M}{2M}$, for M large enough. To finish the argument for (38) check that $|f'(t)| \leq 2(d-2)f(t)/t$ for all $t > 0$. Now for all t satisfying (39) this yields

$$|f'(t)| \leq \frac{4(d-2)c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}}{L_M}.$$

The right hand side above is clearly less than $K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}$, for M large enough, which is what we wanted to prove.

We separate the analysis into three cases:

- a) $\beta > 1$ and $\max_{[0,1]} f \leq c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M$,
- b) $\beta > 1$ and $\max_{[0,1]} f > c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M$,
- c) $\beta < 1$.

To summarize, in case a) we have

$$f(1 - 2k/M) \leq c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M, \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq M/2 - 1, \quad (40)$$

in case b)

$$f(1 - 2k/M) \begin{cases} \leq c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M, & \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq n_1, \\ \geq c_2 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M, & \text{for } n_1 \leq k \leq n_2, \text{ if } n_1 < n_0, \\ \leq c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M, & \text{for } n_2 \leq k \leq M/2 - 1, \text{ if } n_2 < n_0, \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

and in the case c)

$$f(1 - 2k/M) \begin{cases} \geq c_2 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M, & \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq n_2, \\ \leq c_1 K_0^{1/(1-\beta)}/M, & \text{for } n_2 \leq k \leq M/2 - 1, \text{ if } n_2 < n_0. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

For the case a) note that (40) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{K_0}{M^{(1-\beta)/2}} \leq c_1^{\beta-1} (M - 2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1-\beta}. \quad (43)$$

Because $M - 2n_0 \geq L_M$ and (31) we can apply Corollary 2.5 to get that the event that $|K_k - K_0| \leq \varepsilon K_0$ for $0 \leq k \leq n_0$ has probability at least

$$1 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M - 2n_0)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right) - \delta_M \geq 1 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{1}{L_M^{(1+\beta)/2}} + \frac{1}{L_M} \right) - \delta_M.$$

The inequality above follows from the definition of n_0 . This suffices for part *i*) in the case a).

Next we assume that we are under the assumptions of case b). From the first inequality in (41) we obtain that (43) holds for $0 \leq k \leq n_1$. Because $M - 2n_1 \geq M - 2n_0$ we can apply Corollary 2.5 like in the case a) and conclude that the event that $|K_k - K_0| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} K_0$ holds for all $0 \leq k \leq n_1$, has probability of at least

$$1 - \frac{9C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M - 2n_1)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right) - \delta_M \geq 1 - \frac{9C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{1}{L_M^{(1+\beta)/2}} + \frac{1}{L_M} \right) - \delta_M.$$

Now if $n_1 = n_0$ we are done with the analysis of the event in *i*) in the case b).

Otherwise assume that $|K_k - K_0| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} K_0$ holds for all $0 \leq k \leq n_1$ indeed, and note that (38) implies that

$$\frac{(1 + \varepsilon)^{1/(1-\beta)}}{c_1} f(1 - 2n_1/M) \leq \frac{K_{n_1}^{1/(1-\beta)}}{M} \leq \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^{1/(1-\beta)}}{c_2} f(1 - 2n_1/M), \quad (44)$$

which then by (35) and (34) implies that both X_{n_1} and Y_{n_1} are at least $c' L_M$ for some constant c' .

Define $M' = M - 2n_1$, $X'_k = X_{n_1+k}$, $Y'_k = Y_{n_1+k}$, $Z'_k = Z_{n_1+k}$ and

$$K'_k = \frac{Y'_k}{X_k'^{1/\beta} (1 - 2k/M')^{(1-1/\beta)/2}}.$$

It is easy to check that in fact

$$K'_k = K_{n_1+k}^{-1/\beta} \left(\frac{M'}{M} \right)^{(1-1/\beta)/2}. \quad (45)$$

Similarly to (43), the second inequality in (41) implies that for $n_1 \leq k \leq n_2$

$$\frac{K_0}{M^{(1-\beta)/2}} \geq c_2^{\beta-1} (M - 2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2k/M)^{d/2-1} \right)^{1-\beta}.$$

Combined with the inequality $K_{n_1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) K_0$,

$$K_{n_1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) c_2^{\beta-1} M^{(1-\beta)/2} (M - 2(n_1 + k))^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2(n_1 + k)/M)^{d/2-1} \right)^{1-\beta},$$

for $0 < k \leq n_2 - n_1$. Raising the above inequality to the power of $-1/\beta$ and using (33) and (45) we obtain

$$\frac{K'_0}{M'^{(1-1/\beta)/2}} \leq \frac{(1 + \varepsilon)^{1-1/\beta}}{(1 - \varepsilon)^{1/\beta} c_2^{1-1/\beta}} (M' - 2k)^{(1-1/\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z'_0}{M'} (1 - 2k/M')^{d/2-1} \right)^{1-1/\beta}, \quad (46)$$

for all $0 \leq k \leq n_2 - n_1$. By Corollary 2.5 we have that the event $|K'_k - K'_0| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{\beta+3}} K'_0$, for all $0 \leq k \leq n_2 - n_1$, is of probability at least

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \frac{4^{\beta+3}C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M'^{(1-1/\beta)/2}}{(M' - 2(n_2 - n_1))^{(1+1/\beta)/2} K'_0} + \frac{1}{Y'_0} \right) - \delta_{M'} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{4^{\beta+3}C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{(1+\varepsilon)^{1/\beta} K_0^{1/\beta}}{(M - 2n_2)^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}} M^{\frac{1-\beta}{2\beta}}} + \frac{1}{Y_{n_1}} \right) - \delta_{L_M} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{4^{\beta+3}C}{\varepsilon^2} \left((1+\varepsilon)^{1/\beta} L_M^{-\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}} + (c' L_M)^{-1} \right) - \delta_{L_M}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where we used the fact that $n_2 \geq n_0$, the definition of n_0 and the lower bound $Y_{n_1} \geq c' L_M$. Then this event can be rewritten as

$$\left| \left(\frac{K_{n_1+k}}{K_{n_1}} \right)^{-1/\beta} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{\beta+3}}, \text{ for all } 0 \leq k \leq n_2 - n_1,$$

which, using the fact that $\varepsilon \leq 1/2$ easily implies that

$$|K_{n_1+k} - K_{n_1}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} K_{n_1}, \text{ for all } 0 \leq k \leq n_2 - n_1,$$

and

$$|K_k - K_0| \leq |K_k - K_{n_1}| + |K_{n_1} - K_0| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \right) K_0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} K_0 \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} K_0, \text{ for all } n_1 \leq k \leq n_2. \quad (48)$$

If $n_2 = n_0$ we are done.

Otherwise, assume that the event in (48) holds and observe that (44) holds when n_1 is replaced by n_2 . Thus again we have that $X_{n_2} \geq c' L_M$.

Define $M'' = M - 2n_2$, $X''_k = X_{n_2+k}$, $Y''_k = Y_{n_2+k}$, $Z''_k = Z_{n_2+k}$ and

$$K''_k = \frac{X''_k}{Y''_k{}^\beta (1 - 2k/M'')^{(1-\beta)/2}} = K_{n_2+k} \left(\frac{M''}{M} \right)^{(1-\beta)/2}.$$

Following the argument that lead to (46), and using the third inequality in (41) we can deduce that

$$\frac{K''_0}{M''^{(1-\beta)/2}} \leq (1+\varepsilon)(1-\varepsilon)^{1-\beta} c_1^{\beta-1} (M'' - 2k)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z''_0}{M''} (1 - 2k/M'')^{d/2-1} \right)^{1-\beta}.$$

By Corollary 2.5 we have that with probability at least

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \frac{16C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M''^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M'' - 2(n_0 - n_2))^{(1+\beta)/2} K''_0} + \frac{1}{X''_0} \right) - \delta_{M''} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{16C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(1-\varepsilon_2)(M - 2n_0)^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_{n_1}} \right) - \delta_{L_M} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{16C}{\varepsilon^2} \left((1-\varepsilon_2)^{-1} L_M^{-(1+\beta)/2} + (c' L_M^{-1}) \right) - \delta_{L_M}. \end{aligned}$$

the event

$$|K''_k - K''_0| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} K''_0, \text{ for some } 0 \leq k \leq n_0 - n_2$$

occurs. After a glance at the definition of K_k'' we proceed as in the previous step and finish the analysis of event in $i)$ in the case b).

The case c) is handled in the same way. The first inequality in (42), inequality (31), the fact that $M - 2n_0 \geq L_M$ and Corollary 2.5 imply that the event $|K_k - K_0| \leq \varepsilon K_0/3$, for $0 \leq k \leq n_2$, has probability at least

$$1 - \frac{9C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{(M - 2n_2)^{(1+\beta)/2} K_0} + \frac{1}{X_0} \right) - \delta_M \geq 1 - \frac{9C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{1}{L_M^{(1+\beta)/2}} + \frac{1}{L_M} \right) - \delta_M.$$

This finishes the proof if $n_2 = n_0$. Otherwise, observe that (44) holds and thus $Y_{n_2} \geq c' L_M$. Then define $X'_k = X_{n_2+k}$, $Y'_k = Y_{n_2+k}$, $Z'_k = Z_{n_2+k}$, $M' = M - 2n_2$ and

$$K'_k = \frac{Y'_k}{X_k'^{1/\beta} (1 - 2k/M')^{(1-1/\beta)/2}} = K_k^{-1/\beta} \left(\frac{M}{M'} \right)^{\frac{1-\beta}{2\beta}}.$$

The second inequality in (42) and (32) now imply

$$\frac{K'_0}{M'^{(1-1/\beta)/2}} \leq \frac{c_1^{(1-\beta)/\beta} (1+\varepsilon)^{1-1/\beta}}{(1-\varepsilon)^{1/\beta}} (M' - 2k)^{(1-1/\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z'_0}{M'} (1 - 2k/M')^{d/2-1} \right)^{1-1/\beta}.$$

Now we can apply Corollary 2.5 and conclude that with probability at least

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \frac{4^{\beta+1}C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{M'^{(1-1/\beta)/2}}{(M - 2n_0)^{(1+1/\beta)/2} K'_0} + \frac{1}{Y'_0} \right) - \delta_{M'} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{4^{\beta+1}C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{(1+\varepsilon)^{1/\beta} K_0^{1/\beta}}{(M - 2n_0)^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}} M^{\frac{1-\beta}{2\beta}}} + \frac{1}{c' L_M} \right) - \delta_{L_M} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{4^{\beta+1}C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\frac{(1+\varepsilon)^{1/\beta}}{L_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}}} + \frac{1}{c' L_M} \right) - \delta_{L_M}, \end{aligned}$$

we have that $|K'_k - K'_0| \leq \varepsilon 2^{-\beta-1} K'_0$ for all $0 \leq k \leq n_0 - n_2$. Using the analysis similar to the case b) we see that this event implies $|K_{n_2+k} - K_0| \leq \varepsilon K_0$, for $0 \leq k \leq n_0 - n_2$. This finishes the proof of part $i)$.

Now we proceed with the proof of part $ii)$. When $K_0 \leq M^{(1-\beta)/2}$, the inequality $Y_{n_0} \leq M - 2n_0$ implies

$$K_{n_0} \geq X_{n_0} M^{(1-\beta)/2} (M - 2n_0)^{-(1+\beta)/2},$$

which, by the definition of n_0 and the fact that $K_{n_0} \leq (1+\varepsilon)K_0$, yields $X_{n_0} \leq (1+\varepsilon)L_M^{(1+\beta)/2}$. When $K_0 \geq M^{(1-\beta)/2}$ then the inequality $X_{n_0} \leq M - 2n_0$ implies

$$K_{n_0} \leq M^{(1-\beta)/2} (M - 2n_0)^{(1+\beta)/2} Y_{n_0}^{-\beta},$$

which, by the definition of n_0 and the fact that $K_{n_0} \geq (1-\varepsilon)K_0$, yields $Y_{n_0} \leq (1-\varepsilon)^{-1/\beta} L_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}}$. If $K_0 \leq M^{(1-\beta)/2}$ denote by U the process X and $\tau = \frac{1+\beta}{2}$ and if $K_0 \geq M^{(1-\beta)/2}$ denote by U the process Y and $\tau = \frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}$. (if $K_0 = M^{(1-\beta)/2}$ do either). Furthermore denote by n' and n'' the largest integers such that

$$M - 2n' \geq M \left(\frac{L_M^\tau}{Z_0} \right)^{2/d}, \text{ and } M - 2n'' \geq M \left(\frac{1}{L_M Z_0} \right)^{2/d}.$$

If $n_0 \geq n'$ then by Theorem 4.1 i) we know that with probability converging to 1 as M tends to infinity we have that $Z_{n_0} \leq 2L_M^\tau$. For the constant C from Theorem 4.1 i) we have $L_M^{2\tau/d} \geq \frac{CZ_0^{2/d}}{M^\varepsilon}$, for M large enough, and thus we can apply the theorem. The obvious inequality $U_n \leq U_{n_0} + Z_{n_0}$, for $n \geq n_0$ finishes the argument in this case.

Otherwise we assume that $n_0 < n'$. We finish the proof by showing that we have no new vertices with the color of type U after the time n_0 , that is that $U_{k+1} \leq U_k$, for $k \geq n_0$. To this end denote

$$\mathbf{U}_1 = \{U_{k+1} \leq U_k : n_0 \leq k \leq n'\}, \mathbf{U}_2 = \{U_{k+1} \leq U_k : n' \leq k \leq n''\}, \mathbf{U}_3 = \{U_{k+1} \leq U_k : n'' \leq k\}.$$

Since with high probability Z_k is bounded by a constant multiple of $Z_0(1-2k/M)^{d/2}$, for $k \leq n'$, by Remark 2.3, the probability of the event $\mathbf{U}_1$ can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_1) &\geq \prod_{k=n_0}^{n'} \left(1 - \frac{c_2 L_M^\tau Z_0 (1-2k/M)^{d/2}}{(M-2k-Z_0(1-2k/M)^{d/2})(M-2k)} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{c_2}{1-2^{-d/2+1}} \sum_{k=n_0}^{n'} \frac{L_M^\tau Z_0 (1-2k/M)^{d/2}}{(M-2k)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that fact that $Z_0 \leq M$ and $M-2k \leq M/2$, for $k \geq n_0$, which follows from (5). It suffices to prove that the above sum converges to 0. To estimate it calculate

$$\frac{L_M^\tau Z_0}{M^2} \sum_{k=n_0}^{n'} \left(1 - \frac{2k}{M} \right)^{d/2-2} \leq \frac{L_M^\tau Z_0}{M} \int_{1-2(n'+1)/M}^{1-2(n_0-1)/M} t^{d/2-2} dt \leq \frac{2}{d-2} L_M^\tau \left(\frac{M-2n_0+2}{M} \right)^{d/2-1}, \quad (49)$$

where the first inequality follows by monotonicity of the function $t \mapsto t^{d/2-2}$. From (5) it is easy to see that the last term converges to 0 (the only thing to check is that $(d/2-1)(1-2(1+\beta)^3/\beta) + \tau < 0$ and $(d/2-1)(1-2(1+\beta)^3/\beta^2) + \tau < 0$).

Next we bound the probability of $\mathbf{U}_2$. Using the inequality

$$M - 2n'' \geq \frac{M}{Z_0^{2/d} L_M^{2/d}} \geq \frac{M^{1-2/d}}{L_M^{2/d}}, \quad (50)$$

we obtain $M - 2n'' \geq 2L_M$, for M large enough and, since with probability converging to 1 we have $Z_n \leq 2L_M^\tau$, for $n \geq n'$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_2) &\geq \prod_{k=n'}^{n''} \left(1 - \frac{c_3 L_M^{2\tau}}{(M-2k)(M-2k-L_M)} \right) \geq 1 - 2c_3 L_M^{2\tau} \sum_{k=n'}^{n''} \frac{1}{(M-2k)^2} \\ &\geq 1 - 4c_3 \frac{L_M^{2\tau}}{M-2n''-2} \geq 1 - 4c_3 \frac{L_M^{2\tau+2/d}}{M^{1-2/d}}. \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side clearly converges to 1 which finishes the analysis of the event $\mathbf{U}_2$.

By Theorem 4.1 i) we have $Z_k = 0$ for $k \geq n''$ with probability converging to 1. On this event we surely have $U_k \leq U_{n''}$, for all $k \geq n''$. Combined with the fact that the probabilities of the events $\mathbf{U}_1$ and $\mathbf{U}_2$ converge to 1, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_3)$ also converges to 1, as M tends to infinity. $\square$

The second component in the proof of Thm. 2.2 is the following lemma which gives to give us estimates for the function ϕ defined in the theorem.

Lemma 2.8. *For $\beta \neq 1$ define the function $\phi: (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as $\phi_\beta(t) = \frac{(1-t)^{1/(\beta-1)}}{t^{\beta/(\beta-1)}}$. Then the function ϕ_β is one-to-one and onto and there are constants $c_1 < c_2$ such that the inverse function $\phi_\beta^{-1}: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, 1)$ satisfies*

$$c_1 \left(s^{1/\beta-1} \wedge 1 \right) \leq \phi_\beta^{-1}(s) \leq \left(c_2 s^{1/\beta-1} \right) \wedge 1.$$

Proof. For $\beta > 1$ the function ϕ_β is decreasing and $\phi_\beta(1) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi_\beta(t)}{t^{\beta/(\beta-1)}} = 1$. Therefore ϕ_β^{-1} is decreasing with $\phi_\beta^{-1}(0) = 1$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi_\beta^{-1}(s)}{s^{1/\beta-1}} = 1$. This proves the claim for $\beta > 1$. For $\beta < 1$ the function ϕ_β is increasing with $\phi(0) = 0$, $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi_\beta(t)}{t^{\beta/(\beta-1)}} = 1$ and $\lim_{t \uparrow 1} \phi_\beta(t) = \infty$. This implies that ϕ_β^{-1} is also increasing and $\phi_\beta^{-1}(0) = 0$, $\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi_\beta^{-1}(s)}{s^{1/\beta-1}} = 1$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \phi_\beta^{-1}(s) = 1$, which is enough to deduce the claim in the case $\beta < 1$. $\square$

Remark 2.4. *Note that the replacing the roles of processes X and Y and setting X to have rate 1 and Y to have the rate $1/\beta$ in Lemma 2.3 causes the process K_n to become $K_n^{-1/\beta}$ and the value of n_0 and the exponents on L_M in part ii) to remain unchanged. Therefore if both X_0 and Y_0 are bounded from below by an appropriate power of L_M we do not need to assume that $X_0 \leq Y_0$ for Lemma 2.3 to hold.*

We are now ready to prove Thm. 2.2.

Proof of Thm. 2.2. Throughout the proof we assume that the sequence (L_M) grows slowly enough, so that it satisfies the assumptions in Lemma 2.3, and so that, similarly to Remark 2.1 we can conclude that $L_M^\kappa M^{-\beta} \leq K_0 \leq M L_M^{-\kappa}$ and $1 - 2n_0/M \leq L_M^{-\kappa}$ for $\kappa > 0$ appropriate for our calculations.

Define n_1 as the largest integer such that $M - 2n_1 \geq M(Z_0 L_M)^{-2/d}$. By the assumptions it follows that $\varepsilon L_M^{2/d} M Z_0^{-2/d}$ converges to ∞ and thus we can apply Theorem 4.1 to conclude that for any $0 \leq n \leq n_1$ we have

$$\frac{Z_n}{Z_0} = (1 \pm o(1)) \left(1 - \frac{2n}{M} \right)^{d/2}.$$

Also define $m = n_0 \wedge n_1$.

First we prove all the results with $\bar{R}$ replaced by R_m . Then we show that $(\bar{R} - R_m)/Z_0$ is small and also small compared to $M^{1/\beta-1} K^{-1/\beta}$, which by $Z_0/d = N - R_0 - B_0$ allows us to replace R_m with $\bar{R}$.

By Lemma 2.3 for any $\varepsilon > 0$ asymptotically almost surely we have

$$1 - \frac{Y_n}{X_n + Y_n} = (1 \pm o(1)) \left(\frac{Y_n}{X_n + Y_n} \right)^\beta K_0 \left(\frac{M - 2n}{M} \right)^{(1-\beta)/2} (X_n + Y_n)^{\beta-1}.$$

Combined with Theorem 4.1 this gives

$$\frac{1 - r_n}{r_n^\beta} = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \frac{K_0}{M^{1-\beta} (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2n/M)^{d/2-1} \right)^{1-\beta}}$$

for $0 \leq n \leq m$. For $\beta = 1$ this yields

$$r_n = (1 \pm o(1)) \frac{1}{1 + K_0} = (1 \pm o(1)) \frac{Y_0}{X_0 + Y_0}, \text{ for } 0 \leq n \leq m.$$

Define the function $\varphi_\beta: (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi_\beta(t) = (1 - t)t^{-\beta}$ and observe that the derivative of φ_β is bounded from below. Then the derivative of the inverse function φ_β^{-1} is bounded from above, which gives that asymptotically almost surely

$$r_n = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \varphi_\beta^{-1} \left(\frac{K_0}{M^{1-\beta} (1 - 2n/M)^{(1-\beta)/2} \left(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2n/M)^{d/2-1}\right)^{1-\beta}} \right)$$

and

$$r_n = (1 \pm \varepsilon) \phi_\beta^{-1} \left(MK_0^{1/(\beta-1)} \left((1 - 2n/M)^{1/2} - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2n/M)^{(d-1)/2} \right) \right),$$

for $0 \leq n \leq m$.

At the n -th step the conditional probability that in the $n + 1$ -th step we add a new red vertex is equal to

$$\frac{Y_n}{X_n + Y_n} \frac{Z_n}{M - 2n - 1} = (1 \pm o(1)) r_n \frac{Z_n}{M - 2n},$$

for M large enough. By Remark 2.3 for $\beta = 1$ thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} |R_m - R_0| &= (1 \pm o(1)) \sum_{n=0}^m \frac{Y_0}{X_0 + Y_0} \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - 2n/M)^{d/2-1} \rightarrow (1 \pm o(1)) \frac{Y_0}{X_0 + Y_0} \frac{Z_0}{2} \int_{1-2m/M}^1 t^{d/2-1} dt \\ &= (1 \pm \varepsilon) \frac{Y_0}{X_0 + Y_0} \frac{Z_0}{d} \left(1 - (1 - 2m/M)^{d/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(1 - 2m/M)^{d/2}$ converges to 0 we can disregard this term, which proves (1).

For $\beta \neq 1$ we proceed as follows. By Remark 2.3 asymptotically almost surely we have

$$|R_m - R_0| = (1 \pm o(1)) \sum_{n=0}^m \phi_\beta^{-1} \left(MK_0^{1/(\beta-1)} \left((1 - \frac{2n}{M})^{1/2} - \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - \frac{2n}{M})^{(d-1)/2} \right) \right) \frac{Z_0}{M} (1 - \frac{2n}{M})^{d/2-1}.$$

The sum on the right hand side above converges to the integral

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{Z_0}{2} \int_{1-2m/M}^1 \phi_\beta^{-1} \left(MK_0^{1/(\beta-1)} \left(s^{1/2} - \frac{Z_0}{M} s^{(d-1)/2} \right) \right) s^{d/2-1} ds \\ &= \frac{Z_0}{d} \int_{(1-2m/M)^{d/2}}^1 \phi_\beta^{-1} \left(MK_0^{1/(\beta-1)} \left(t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \right) \right) dt, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (2), except for the different lower bound in the integral. Note that for the convergence of Riemann sums to the corresponding integral we used the piecewise convexity and concavity of subintegral functions.

Before giving the argument for the correction of the lower bound we prove (3). For $\beta = 1$ the inequalities in (3) are easy to check, so we focus on the case $\beta \neq 1$. By Lemma 2.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \int_{(1-2m/M)^{d/2}}^1 \frac{M^{1/\beta-1}}{K_0^{1/\beta}} \left(t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \right)^{1/\beta-1} \wedge 1 \, dt &\leq \frac{\bar{R} - R_0}{N - R_0 - B_0} \\ &\leq \int_{(1-2m/M)^{d/2}}^1 c_2 \frac{M^{1/\beta-1}}{K_0^{1/\beta}} \left(t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \right)^{1/\beta-1} \wedge 1 \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

The trivial inequality $\bar{R} - R_0 \leq N - R_0 - B_0$ yields 1 for the upper bound in (3). For the second part of the upper bound in (3), it is enough to prove that the integral

$$\int_{(1-2m/M)^{d/2}}^1 \left(t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \right)^{1/\beta-1} dt \quad (51)$$

is bounded from above by a constant depending on β and d only. This follows from the inequalities

$$t^{1/d} - t^{(d-1)/d} \leq t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \leq t^{1/d},$$

and the fact that $t \mapsto t^{-(1-1/\beta)/d}$ is integrable on $(0, 1)$. Actually the inequalities above, together with the fact that $(1 - 2m/M)^{d/2} \leq 1/2$ for M large enough, imply that the minimum of the function $\left(t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \right)^{1/\beta-1}$ is bounded from below on $[1/2, 3/4]$. Thus the integral in (51) is bounded from below by a positive constant depending only on d and β . By considering the cases when $M^{1/\beta-1} K_0^{-1/\beta}$ is smaller or greater than 1, the lower bound in (3) follows.

Now we come back to fixing the lower bound in the integral in (2). To this end it suffices to prove that

$$\int_0^{(1-2m/M)^{d/2}} \frac{M^{1/\beta-1}}{K_0^{1/\beta}} \left(t^{1/d} - \frac{Z_0}{M} t^{(d-1)/d} \right)^{1/\beta-1} \wedge 1 \, dt \leq \delta_M \left(\frac{M^{1/\beta-1}}{K_0^{1/\beta}} \wedge 1 \right), \quad (52)$$

for a sequence (δ_M) , converging to 0 and depending only on β , d and L_M . When $\frac{M^{1/\beta-1}}{K_0^{1/\beta}} \geq 1$ then (52) holds as long as we take $\delta \geq (1 - 2m/M)^{d/2}$. When $\frac{M^{1/\beta-1}}{K_0^{1/\beta}} < 1$ then (52) holds for

$$\delta_M \geq \int_0^{(1-2m/M)^{d/2}} h(s)^{1/\beta-1} ds,$$

where $h(s) = s^{1/d}$, for $\beta < 1$ and $h(s) = s^{1/d} - s^{(d-1)/d}$, for $\beta > 1$ (in either case $h(s)^{1/\beta-1}$ is integrable in the neighborhood of 0).

To conclude the proof we need to give appropriate upper bounds on $(\bar{R} - R_m)/Z_0$, to replace R_m by $\bar{R}$ above. It suffices to prove that $(\bar{R} - R_m)/Z_0$ and $(\bar{R} - R_m)K_0^{1/\beta} M^{1-1/\beta} Z_0^{-1}$ converge to 0 (and the convergence depends only on β , d and (L_M)).

If $n_1 \leq n_0$ the claim follows from the fact that $\bar{R} - R_m \leq Z_{n_1} \leq 2L_M$. We only need to check that L_M/Z_0 and $L_M K_0^{1/\beta} M^{1-1/\beta} Z_0^{-1}$ converge to 0. The first convergence is trivial and for the second calculate

$$L_M \left(\frac{K_0}{M} \right)^{1/\beta} \frac{M}{Z_0} \leq L_M^{2-\kappa/\beta},$$

which converges to 0 for $\kappa > 2\beta$ large enough.

Now assume that $n_0 < n_1$. In the case $K_0 \geq M^{(1-\beta)/2}$, by Lemma 2.3 and the arguments above we have that $\bar{R} - R_{n_0}$ is asymptotically almost surely bounded by a constant (depending on β, d and (L_M)) multiple of

$$\sum_{n=0}^{n_0} \frac{L_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}}}{(M-2n)(1 - \frac{Z_0}{M}(1-2n/M)^{d/2-1})} \frac{Z_0(1-2n/M)^{d/2}}{M-2n-1},$$

which, after passing to the integral, can be shown to be bounded by a constant multiple of

$$\frac{Z_0}{M} L_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}} \left(\frac{M-2n_0}{M} \right)^{d/2-1} \leq 2 \frac{Z_0}{M} L_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}} \left(\frac{K_0}{M} \right)^{1/(1+\beta)},$$

for M large enough. The above converges to 0 when divided by Z_0 . To prove that the expression on the right hand side above divided by $Z_0 M^{1/\beta-1} K_0^{-1/\beta}$ converges to 0 we need to prove that

$$L_M^{\frac{1+\beta}{2\beta}} \left(\frac{K_0}{M} \right)^{1/(1+\beta)+1/\beta}$$

converges to 0. This is true because we can assume that $K_0 \leq M L_M^{-\kappa}$ for κ large enough.

If $K_0 < M^{(1-\beta)/2}$ then we simply need to prove that $M-2n_0$ converges to 0 when divided by either Z_0 or $Z_0 M^{1/\beta-1} K_0^{-1/\beta}$. The first convergence follows trivially from the fact that $Z_0 \geq M/L_M$ and $M-2n_0 \leq M L_M^{-\kappa}$, for κ large enough. The second convergence boils down to showing that

$$\frac{L_M \left(\frac{M^{(1-\beta)/2}}{K_0} \right)^{2/(1+\beta)}}{Z_0 M^{1/\beta-1} K_0^{-1/\beta}} = \frac{L_M}{Z_0} \left(\frac{K_0}{M} \right)^{\frac{1-\beta}{\beta(1+\beta)}}$$

converges to 0. Knowing that $Z_0 \geq M/L_M$, the inequality follows by using $K_0/M \leq L_M^{-\kappa}$ for $\beta \leq 1$ and $K_0 M^\beta \geq L_M^\kappa$ for $\beta > 1$, when κ is large enough. $\square$

Now we can prove Thm. 1.1 i).

Proof of Theorem 1.1 i). By Lemma 2.12, in both Thm. 1.1 and Thm. 1.2 we have $X_0 = \Theta(N^{\alpha_1})$ and $Y_0 = \Theta(N^{\alpha_2})$. Since $M = \Theta(N)$, the condition $\gamma \leq 0$ implies that $\frac{Y_0}{M} \left(\frac{M}{X_0} \right)^{1/\beta}$ is bounded from above by a constant, depending only on β and d , so the claim follows from Theorem 2.2. The case $\gamma \geq 0$ follows by symmetry. $\square$

To prove Thm. 1.1 ii) and iii), we use the following result by Svante Janson (part of Theorem 1.4 in [35]). From now on we denote the Gamma distribution with parameter m by $\Gamma(m, 1)$, that is a probability distribution with the density $t^{m-1} e^{-t} \Gamma(m)^{-1}$, where $\Gamma(m)$ is the Gamma function.

Theorem 2.9 (Janson). *Consider the Pólya urn process (S_n, Z_n) with the replacement matrix $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \delta \end{pmatrix}$, where $\alpha > 0, \delta > 0, S_0 > 0$ and $Z_0 > 0$. Let $U \sim \Gamma(S_0/\alpha, 1)$ and $V \sim \Gamma(Z_0/\delta, 1)$ be two independent random variables with Gamma distribution and parameters S_0/α and Z_0/δ respectively.*

i) If $\alpha = \delta$ then in distribution

$$n^{-1}S_n \rightarrow \frac{U}{U+V}.$$

ii) If $\alpha < \delta$ then in distribution

$$n^{-\alpha/\delta}S_n \rightarrow \alpha UV^{-\alpha/\delta}.$$

Remark 2.5. The natural interpretation of the urn models requires S_0, Z_0 as well as parameters α, δ to be integers. However, we can avoid this assumption by simply defining the step of the urn process $(S_{n+1}, Z_{n+1}) = (S_n + \alpha, Z_n)$ with the probability $S_n/(S_n + Z_n)$ and $(S_{n+1}, Z_{n+1}) = (S_n, Z_n + \delta)$ otherwise. The process (X_n, Y_n) such that $(X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) = (X_n + a_1, Y_n)$, with the probability $\alpha_1 X_n/(\alpha_1 X_n + \alpha_2 Y_n)$ and $(X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) = (X_n, Y_n + a_2)$ otherwise, can be thought of as an urn process in which we draw balls with different weights. It is easy to observe that the process $(S_n, Z_n) = (\alpha_1 X_n, \alpha_2 Y_n)$ is indeed an urn process with $S_0 = \alpha_1 X_0, Z_0 = \alpha_2 Y_0$ and the replacement matrix $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 a_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 ii). Consider the process $(X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1})$ such that $(X_{0,1}, Y_{0,1}) = (dr_0, db_0)$ and $(X_{n+1,1}, Y_{n+1,1}) = (X_{n,1} + d - 2, Y_{n,1})$, with probability $\beta X_n/(\beta X_n + Y_n)$ and $(X_{n+1,1}, Y_{n+1,1}) = (X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1} + d - 2)$ otherwise. From Theorem 2.9 and Remark 2.5 we know that $X_{M^\epsilon,1} = O(M^{\epsilon\beta})$ if $\beta \leq 1$, and $Y_{M^\epsilon,1} = O(M^{\epsilon/\beta})$ for $\beta \geq 1$. Next we show that we can couple the processes (X_n, Y_n) and $(X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1})$ so that with probability converging to 1, as $M \rightarrow \infty$, we have $(X_n, Y_n) = (X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1})$ for all $0 \leq n \leq M^\epsilon$. Showing this gives that $X_{M^\epsilon} = O(M^{\epsilon\beta})$, $Y_{M^\epsilon} = O(M^\epsilon)$ if $\beta \leq 1$, and $X_{M^\epsilon} = O(M^\epsilon)$, $Y_{M^\epsilon} = O(M^{\epsilon/\beta})$ if $\beta \geq 1$, which suffices to prove the claim. Then we can simply apply Theorem 2.2. The construction of the coupling is simple: we set $(X_{n+1,1}, Y_{n+1,1}) = (X_{n,1} + d - 2, Y_{n,1})$ if in the configuration model the first chosen half-edge was *blue* and we set $(X_{n+1,1}, Y_{n+1,1}) = (X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1} + d - 2)$ if in the configuration model the first chosen half-edge was *red*. Then we have that $(X_n, Y_n) = (X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1})$ if for all $k \leq n$, the k th step in the configuration model was a forward step. The conditional probability that the k th step is a backward step is

$$\frac{\beta X_k(X_k - 1) + Y_k(Y_k - 1) + (1 + \beta)X_k Y_k}{(\beta X_k + Y_k)(X_k + Y_k + Z_k - 1)} \leq 2 \frac{X_k + Y_k}{X_k + Y_k + Z_k} \leq \frac{4(d - 2)}{M^{1-\epsilon}}.$$

Here we used the fact that $X_n + Y_n$ can increase by at most $d - 2$ in each step and that $2M^\epsilon < M/2$ for M large enough. Now the probability that the M^ϵ first steps are forward is bounded from below by

$$1 - M^\epsilon \frac{4(d - 2)}{M^{1-\epsilon}},$$

which converges to 0 when $\epsilon < 1/2$. Thus for $\epsilon < 1/2$ with the probability converging to 1 we have $(X_n, Y_n) = (X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1})$ which as discussed above proves the claim. $\square$

For the proof of Theorem 1.1 iii) we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10. Let L_M be a sequence converging to ∞ such that $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} L_M M^{-\gamma} = 0$ for some $0 < \gamma < 1$. Fix a positive integer X_0 and for every M let $Y_0 \geq L_M$ and assume that (L'_M) is a sequence converging to ∞ such that $L_M^{2\beta} \leq Y_0 L_M^{1+\beta} \leq M/\log M$ and $Y_0 L_M'^2 \leq M/\log M$ for all M . Define the stopping time τ as the first k such that $X_k \geq X_0 L_M'^\beta$ or $Y_k \geq Y_0 L_M'$. Then the sequence of random variables $Y_\tau^\beta X_\tau Y_0^{-\beta}$ is tight, as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

First we show how to use the above lemma to prove Theorem 1.1 iii).

Proof of Theorem 1.1 iii). Apply Lemma 2.10 with $L_M = M^{\alpha_2}/d$ and $X_0 = dB_0$ and $L'_M = M^\epsilon$, where ϵ satisfies $\epsilon + \alpha_2 < 1$ and $\epsilon(\beta - 1) < \alpha_2$. Then with the stopping time τ defined as in Lemma 2.10 we have that $Y_\tau^\beta X_\tau Y_0^{-\beta}$ is tight, which in particular implies that with probability converging to 1 we have $X_\tau \geq M^{\epsilon\beta/2}$ and $Y_\tau \geq M^{\alpha_2 + \epsilon/2}$. Since τ is a stopping time, by Strong Markov property we can apply Theorem 2.2 to finish the proof. $\square$

To prove Lemma 2.10 we need the following corollary of Theorem 2.9.

Corollary 2.11. *Consider the Pólya urn process (S_n, Z_n) with the replacement matrix $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \delta \end{pmatrix}$, where $\alpha > 0$, $\delta > 0$. Let (L_M) and (L'_M) be two sequences converging to ∞ , let $S_0 > 0$ be fixed and let $Z_0 \geq L_M$. Define the stopping time τ as the smallest integer k such that $S_k/S_0 \geq L'_M$ or $Z_k/Z_0 \geq L_M^\delta$. Then*

$$Z_0^{\alpha/\delta} \frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \rightarrow \Gamma(S_0/\alpha, 1),$$

in distribution, as $M \rightarrow \infty$. The convergence depends on the sequences (L_M) , (L'_M) , the value of S_0 and the parameters α and δ .

Proof. Define U and V as $\Gamma(S_0/\alpha, 1)$ and $\Gamma(Z_0/\delta, 1)$ distributed independent random variables. Furthermore given the values of S_τ and Z_τ take U' and V' to be $\Gamma(S_\tau/\alpha, 1)$ and $\Gamma(Z_\tau/\delta, 1)$ distributed independent random variables. Recall that the Gamma distribution $\Gamma(m, 1)$ has mean and variance equal to m which by Chebyshev inequality implies that for any ϵ the probability that a $\Gamma(m, 1)$ random variable is in the interval $((1 - \epsilon)m, (1 + \epsilon)m)$ converges to 1, as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since $Z_\tau \geq Z_0 \geq L_M$, this is true for both V and V' ($m = Z_0/\delta$ and $m = Z_\tau/\delta$, respectively), implying there is a sequence $\rho_{M,\epsilon}$ (depending only on (L_M)) such that $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{M,\epsilon} = 0$, and

$$\mathbb{P}((1 - \epsilon/2)Z_0 \leq V \leq (1 + \epsilon/2)Z_0) \geq 1 - \rho_{M,\epsilon} \quad (53)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}((1 - \epsilon/2)Z_\tau \leq V' \leq (1 + \epsilon/2)Z_\tau) \geq 1 - \rho_{M,\epsilon}. \quad (54)$$

Next we show that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a sequence $(\lambda_{M,\epsilon})$ converging to 0 such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{U'}{V'^{\alpha/\delta}} \leq (1 + \epsilon) \frac{x}{Z_0^{\alpha/\delta}} \left| \frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \leq \frac{x}{Z_0^{\alpha/\delta}} \right.\right) \geq 1 - \lambda_{M,\epsilon} \quad (55)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{U'}{V'^{\alpha/\delta}} \geq (1 - \epsilon) \frac{x}{Z_0^{\alpha/\delta}} \left| \frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \geq \frac{x}{Z_0^{\alpha/\delta}} \right.\right) \geq 1 - \lambda_{M,\epsilon}. \quad (56)$$

If $S_\tau \geq L_M'^{\alpha/2}$ then (55), (56) follow from (53), (54) and the analogous bound for U' . If $S_\tau \leq L_M'^{\alpha/2}$ then we have $Z_\tau \geq Z_0 L_M'^{\delta}$ and we only need to prove (55), since $S_\tau Z_\tau^{-\alpha/\delta} \leq Z_0^{-\alpha/\delta} L_M'^{-\alpha/2}$. This inequality follows from the fact that we either have $V' \leq (1 - \epsilon)Z_\tau$, or $U' \geq (1 + \epsilon)(1 - \epsilon)^{\alpha/\delta} L_M'^{\alpha}$. The first event has probability bounded from above by $\rho_{M,\epsilon}$ and the second one, by Markov inequality, has probability at most $(1 + \epsilon)^{-1}(1 - \epsilon)^{-\alpha/\delta} L_M'^{-\alpha/2}$.

If $\alpha < \delta$ then, by Theorem 2.9, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ the random variable $(n-\tau)^{-\alpha/\delta} S_n$ converges in distribution to $\alpha U' V'^{-\alpha/\delta}$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and other parameters stay fixed. Since τ is less than $S_0 L_M'^\alpha / \alpha + Z_0 L_M'^\delta / \delta$, which doesn't depend on n , this is also true when $(n-\tau)^{-\alpha/\delta} S_n$ is replaced by $n^{-\alpha/\delta} S_n$. For fixed M and n large enough, (55), (56) now implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \leq \frac{x}{Z_0^{\alpha/\delta}}\right) \leq (1 - 2\lambda_{M,\epsilon})^{-1} \mathbb{P}\left(n^{-\alpha/\delta} S_n \leq \alpha(1+\epsilon) \frac{x}{Z_0^{\alpha/\delta}}\right).$$

Again, by Theorem 2.9, the probability on the right hand side above converges to $\mathbb{P}(UV^{-\alpha/\delta} \leq (1+\epsilon)xZ_0^{-\alpha/\delta})$ which in turn is bounded by $\mathbb{P}(U \leq (1+\epsilon)(1+\epsilon/2)^{\alpha/\delta}x) + \rho_{M,\epsilon}$. Taking $M \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain that

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_0^{\alpha/\delta} \frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \leq x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(U \leq (1+\epsilon)(1+\epsilon/2)^{\alpha/\delta}x),$$

and as $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary we obtain the upper bound on $\mathbb{P}(Z_0^{\alpha/\delta} \frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \leq x)$. Using (56) we can obtain the upper bound on $\mathbb{P}(Z_0^{\alpha/\delta} \frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \geq x)$ in the same way which proves the claim when $\alpha < \delta$.

By using the same arguments as in the previous case, for $\delta < \alpha$, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ the random variable $n^{-\delta/\alpha} Z_n$ converges in distribution to $\delta V' U'^{-\delta/\alpha}$ and thus for a fixed M and n large enough we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_\tau}{Z_\tau^{\alpha/\delta}} \leq \frac{x}{Z_0^{\alpha/\delta}}\right) \leq (1 - 2\lambda_{M,\epsilon})^{-1} \mathbb{P}\left(n^{-\delta/\alpha} Z_n \geq \delta(1+\epsilon)^{-\delta/\alpha} \frac{Z_0}{x^{\delta/\alpha}}\right).$$

The probability on the right hand side above converges to $\mathbb{P}(VU^{-\delta/\alpha} \geq (1+\epsilon)^{-\delta/\alpha} Z_0 x^{-\delta/\alpha})$ which in turn is bounded by $\mathbb{P}(U \leq (1+\epsilon)^{1+\alpha/\delta}x) + \rho_{M,\epsilon}$. Taking $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ proves one bound in this case. As before the other bound is proven in the same way.

For the case $\alpha = \delta$ observe that $S_\tau/Z_\tau \leq x/Z_0$ and $S_\tau/Z_\tau \geq x/Z_0$ are equivalent to $S_\tau/(S_\tau + Z_\tau) \leq x/(x + Z_0)$ and $S_\tau/(S_\tau + Z_\tau) \geq x/(x + Z_0)$ respectively, and argue as before. $\square$

Now we prove Lemma 2.10.

Proof of Lemma 2.10. Define the stopping time $\sigma = \tau \wedge (M/4 - 1)$. Consider the process (X'_n, Y'_n, Z'_n) which corresponds to (X_n, Y_n, Z_n) with disregarded connections between *blue* and *red* half-edges, and between *red* half-edge. More precisely let $(X'_0, Y'_0, Z'_0) = (X_0, Y_0, Z_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} (X'_{n+1}, Y'_{n+1}, Z'_{n+1}) &= (X'_n + d - 2, Y'_n, Z'_n - d), \quad \text{with probability } \frac{\beta X_n}{\beta X_n + Y_n}, \\ (X'_{n+1}, Y'_{n+1}, Z'_{n+1}) &= (X'_n, Y'_n + d - 2, Z'_n - d), \quad \text{with probability } \frac{Y_n Z_n}{(\beta X_n + Y_n)(X_n + Y_n + Z_n - 1)}, \\ (X'_{n+1}, Y'_{n+1}, Z'_{n+1}) &= (X'_n, Y'_n - 2, Z'_n), \quad \text{with probability } \frac{Y_n(X_n + Y_n - 1)}{(\beta X_n + Y_n)(X_n + Y_n + Z_n - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We can couple the processes (X_n, Y_n, Z_n) and (X'_n, Y'_n, Z'_n) so that $X'_{n+1} = X'_n + d - 2$ if a *blue* half-edge is chosen in the first part of the step of the (X_n, Y_n) process, $Y'_{n+1} = Y'_n + d - 2$ if $Y_{n+1} = Y_n + d - 2$ and $Y'_{n+1} = Y'_n - 2$ if a *red* half-edge is chosen in the first part of the step of the

(X_n, Y_n) process and $Y_{n+1} < Y_n$. This coupling gives us $(X'_k, Y'_k, Z'_k) = (X_k, Y_k, Z_k)$, if $X_{\ell+1} \geq X_\ell$ for all $\ell < k$. Given $k < \sigma$ the conditional probability that $X_{k+1} < X_k$ is equal to

$$\frac{\beta X_k(X_k - 1) + (1 + \beta)X_k Y_k}{(\beta X_k + Y_k)(X_k + Y_k + Z_k - 1)} \leq \frac{(2 + \beta)X_k}{X_k + Y_k + Z_k - 1} \leq 2 \frac{2X_0 L_M'^\beta}{M}.$$

By a simple union bound it follows that the probability that $X_{k+1} \geq X_k$ for all $k \leq 2(X_0 L_M'^\beta + Y_0 L_M')$ $\wedge \sigma$ converges to 1. Since by the urn result in Theorem 4.1 with probability converging to 1 we have that $\tau \leq 2(X_0 L_M'^\beta + Y_0 L_M') \leq M/4 - 1$, we conclude that we can couple the processes (X_n, Y_n, Z_n) and (X'_n, Y'_n, Z'_n) so that $(X_k, Y_k, Z_k) = (X'_k, Y'_k, Z'_k)$ for all $k \leq \tau$, with probability converging to 1. Therefore in the rest of the proof we replace the process (X_n, Y_n, Z_n) by (X'_n, Y'_n, Z'_n) and τ by τ' which is the first time k that $X'_k \geq L_M'^\beta$ or $Y'_k \geq Y_0 L_M'$. Clearly we have $\tau = \tau'$ with probability converging to 1 as $M \rightarrow \infty$. Also set $\sigma' = \tau' \wedge (M/4 - 1)$.

Next construct the process $(X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1})$ so that $(X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1}) = (X_0, Y_0)$ and $(X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1}) = (X_{n,1} + d - 2, Y_{n,1})$ with the probability $\beta X_{n,1}/(\beta X_{n,1} + Y_{n,1})$ and $(X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1}) = (X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1} + d - 2)$ otherwise. For $\epsilon > 0$ construct the process $(X_{n,2}, Y_{n,2})$ with the same transition probabilities and such that $(X_{0,2}, Y_{0,2}) = (X_0, (1 - \epsilon)Y_0)$. Observe that we can couple the processes (X'_n, Y'_n) and $(X_{n,1}, Y_{n,1})$ so that $X'_n \geq X_{n,1}$ and $Y'_n \leq Y_{n,1}$, for all n . Furthermore for all k such that $Y_{k,2} \leq Y'_k$, whenever $X'_{k+1} = X'_k + d - 2$ we can set $X_{k+1,2} = X_{k,2} + d - 2$. Using this coupling we have that $X'_k \leq X_{k,2}$ and $Y'_k \geq Y_{k,2}$ for all $0 \leq k < \kappa$, where κ is the first time k such that $Y'_k \leq Y_{k,2}$. Clearly if $\kappa < \sigma'$ then there are at least $\epsilon d Y_0$ indices $k < \sigma'$ such that $Y'_{k+1} = Y'_k - 2$. Given $k < \sigma'$ the conditional probability that $Y'_{k+1} = Y'_k - 2$ is equal to

$$\frac{Y'_k(Y'_k - 1)}{(\beta X'_k + Y'_k)(X'_k + Y'_k + Z'_k - 1)} \leq \frac{Y'_k}{X'_k + Y'_k + Z'_k} \leq 2 \frac{Y_0 L_M'}{M}.$$

The expected number of indices $0 \leq k \leq 2(X_0 L_M'^\beta + Y_0 L_M') \wedge \sigma'$ such that $Y'_{k+1} = Y'_k - 2$ is therefore bounded by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2(X_0 L_M'^\beta + Y_0 L_M')} 2 \frac{Y_0 L_M'}{M} \leq 8 \frac{Y_0^2 L_M'^2}{M}.$$

By Markov inequality the probability that the number of such indices is at least $\epsilon d Y_0$ converges to 0. Since $\tau' = \tau$ with probability converging to 1 we have that $\tau' \leq 2(X_0 L_M'^\beta + Y_0 L_M') \leq M/4 - 1$ with the probability converging to 1, as $M \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that we can couple the processes (X'_n, Y'_n) and $(X_{n,2}, Y_{n,2})$ so that with probability converging to 1 we have $X'_n \leq X_{n,2}$ and $Y'_n \geq Y_{n,2}$, for all $n \leq \tau'$.

Define τ_1 (τ_2) as the first time k that $X_{k,1} \geq X_0 L_M'^\beta$ or $Y_{k,2} \geq Y_0 L_M'$ ($X_{k,1} \geq X_0 L_M'^\beta$ or $Y_{k,2} \geq (1 - \epsilon)Y_0 L_M'$). From Corollary 2.11 and Remark 2.5 we have that, when X_0 is fixed

$$Y_0^\beta \frac{X_{\tau_1,1}}{Y_{\tau_1,1}^{-\beta}} \rightarrow \Gamma(X_0/(d-2), 1)$$

and

$$(1 - \epsilon)^\beta Y_0^\beta \frac{X_{\tau_2,2}}{Y_{\tau_2,2}^{-\beta}} \rightarrow \Gamma(X_0/(d-2), 1).$$

For a sufficiently large C , if $Y_0^\beta X'_\tau Y_{\tau'}'^{-\beta} \leq C^{-1}$ then we necessarily have $Y'_\tau \geq Y_0 L'_M$ and $X'_\tau \leq L_M'^\beta$, which implies that $\tau_1 \leq \tau$, $Y_{\tau_1,1} \geq Y_0 L'_M$ and $X_{\tau_1,1} \leq X_{\tau',1} \leq X'_{\tau'}$. Since $Y_{\tau_1,1}$ and $Y'_{\tau'}$ can only differ by a constant we see that

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(Y_0^\beta \frac{X'_{\tau'}}{Y_{\tau'}'^{-\beta}} \leq C^{-1}\right) \leq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(Y_0^\beta \frac{X_{\tau_1,1}}{Y_{\tau_1,1}^{-\beta}} \leq C^{-1}\right) = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(X_0/(d-2), 1) \leq C^{-1}).$$

The bound on $\mathbb{P}\left(Y_0^\beta \frac{X'_{\tau'}}{Y_{\tau'}'^{-\beta}} \geq C\right)$ can be proven in the same way by comparison with process $(X_{n,2}, Y_{n,2})$. $\square$

Finally, to prove Thm. 1.2 it is enough to show that there is a constant c such that in the setting of Thm. 1.2, with high probability the initial number of *blue* half-edges is $(1 + o(1))cB_0$. This is obvious when B_0 is a constant, so all that is left to prove is that when $B_0 = N^{\alpha_1}$ it is also true.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $G \sim \mathcal{G}(N, d)$, and $\mathcal{B}$ be a random subset of k blue vertices of G , where $k \leq N^{\alpha_1}$. Then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if $\mathcal{B}$ starts spreading with rate β until there are N^{α_1} blue vertices, then the number of active edges (i.e. edges whose clocks have started ticking but haven't fired yet) is $(1 \pm o(1))(d-2)N^{\alpha_1}$ with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{1}{N^\varepsilon})$.*

Proof. Again, we use the configuration model for d -regular graphs on N vertices. Using the same notation used before, let the initial number of *blue* vertices be $B_0 = k$, and $X_0 = dk$ be the initial number of *blue* half-edges. Define L_n to be the number of backward steps by time n , i.e. the number of steps where both half-edges chosen are colored. The transition rule for L_n is

$$L_{n+1} = \begin{cases} L_n & \text{w.p. } 1 - \frac{dk + (d-2)n - dL_n - 1}{dN - 2n - 1} \\ L_n + 1 & \text{w.p. } \frac{dk + (d-2)n - dL_n - 1}{dN - 2n - 1} \end{cases}.$$

By this rule we have the recursion

$$\mathbb{E}L_{n+1} = \left(1 - \frac{d}{dN - 2n - 1}\right) \mathbb{E}L_n + \frac{dk + (d-2)n - 1}{dN - 2n - 1},$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{E}L_{n+1} = \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{dk + (d-2)i - 1}{dN - 2i - 1} \prod_{j=i+1}^n \left(1 - \frac{d}{dN - 2j - 1}\right). \quad (57)$$

Let us approximate this expression. First, look at the product.

$$\prod_{j=i+1}^n \left(1 - \frac{d}{dN - 2j - 1}\right) \leq e^{-d \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{dN - 2j - 1}},$$

and

$$d \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{dN - 2j - 1} \geq d \int_i^n \frac{1}{dN - 2x - 1} dx = -\frac{1}{2} d \ln(dN - 2x - 1) \Big|_i^n = \frac{1}{2} d \ln \left(\frac{dN - 2i - 1}{dN - 2n - 1} \right).$$

Plugging this expression back into (57), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}L_{n+1} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{dk+(d-2)i-1}{dN-2i-1} \left(\frac{dN-2n-1}{dN-2i-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}d} \\
&\leq (dN-2n-1)^{\frac{1}{2}d} \int_0^{n+1} \frac{dk+(d-2)x-1}{(dN-2x-1)^{\frac{1}{2}d+1}} dx \\
&= (x+k-N) \left(\frac{dN-2n-1}{dN-2x-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}d} \Big|_0^{n+1} \\
&= (n+1+k-N) \left(\frac{dN-2n-1}{dN-2n-3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}d} + (N-k) \left(\frac{dN-2n-1}{dN-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}d} \\
&= (n+1+k-N) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \right) + (N-k) \left(1 - \frac{dn}{dN-1} + O\left(\frac{n^2}{N^2}\right) \right) \\
&\leq O\left(\frac{nk}{N}\right) + O\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) + O\left(\frac{k}{N}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For every $n \leq N^{\alpha_1}$ we have $\mathbb{E}L_{n+1} \leq O(N^{2\alpha_1-1})$. The number of vertices added by step n is $k+n-L_n$, therefore, by Markov's Inequality the step when there are N^{α_1} vertices is with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{1}{N^\varepsilon})$, between N^{α_1} and $N^{\alpha_1} - k + N^{2\alpha_1-1+\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

The number of active half-edges at step n is $dk + (d-2)n - dL_n$, and therefore with probability at least $1 - O(\frac{1}{N^\varepsilon})$, the number of active half-edges at the step when there are N^{α_1} vertices is at least $dk + (d-2)N^{\alpha_1} - N^{2\alpha_1-1+\varepsilon}$. Since $\alpha_1 < 1$ implies that $2\alpha_1 - 1 < \alpha_1$, we can choose ε so that $N^{2\alpha_1-1+\varepsilon} = o(N^{\alpha_1})$, which concludes our proof. $\square$

3 The d dimensional torus

As mentioned in the introduction, the behavior of the competing infection process is extremely different when the underlying graph is a d dimensional torus, and not a random d -regular graph. The difference is stated in Thm. 1.3, which is proved in this section. The proof relies on the following shape theorem from [14], due to Cox and Durrett.

Theorem 3.1 (Cox, Durrett). *For any distribution F there exists a convex set A such that for any $\delta > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}((1-\delta)tA \subset \xi_t \subset (1+\delta)tA) \rightarrow 1$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and where $\xi_t = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : d(0, x) \leq t\}$, and $d(0, x)$ is the minimum weight path from 0 to x with edge weights distributed independently according to F .

This theorem was generalized for every $d \geq 3$, see for example [39].

Proof of Thm. 1.3. By Thm. 3.1, and since $|\mathcal{B}_0| = \varepsilon N$, there exist $\alpha > 0$ and a convex set A (A is the convex set associated with the exponential distribution with rate β) such that with high probability $\mathcal{B}_0$ obtained in Thm. 1.3 contains $(1-\delta)\alpha nA$ and is contained in $(1+\delta)\alpha nA$ for some small $\delta > 0$.

Denote the first point in $\mathcal{B}_0$ by v , and the point in $\mathcal{R}_0$ by u . Let both processes continue spreading for some small time $\alpha'n$. At that point, with high probability the *blue* set is contained in the convex set $(1+\delta)(\alpha + \alpha')nA$, and the *red* set is contained in the convex set $(1+\delta)\alpha'nA'$, where A' is the convex set associated with the exponential distribution with rate 1. We can choose α' small enough so that the sets $(1+\delta)(\alpha + \alpha')nA$ centered at v and $(1+\delta)\alpha'nA'$ centered at u

are disjoint. Since at this time, with high probability the *red* set is contained in the convex set $(1 - \delta)\alpha'nA'$, which contains $\Theta(N)$ vertices, the final number of *red* vertices is also linear. $\square$

It is interesting to notice what happens when both vertices start with only one vertex, the *blue* vertex spreads with rate β , and the *red* vertex spreads with rate 1. Without loss of generality we can assume that the *blue* vertex v is at the center of the torus, and denote the *red* vertex u by $u = v + (x_1, \dots, x_d)n$, where $x_1, \dots, x_d \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Denote, as before, the convex set associated with the exponential distribution with rate β by A , and the convex set associated with the exponential distribution with rate 1 by A' . We can think of A, A' as unit balls of the metrics d, d' respectively, where $d(v, w) = \{\min t | w \in tA\}$ and $d'(u, w) = \{\min t | w \in tA'\}$. Then with high probability, the final *blue* and *red* sets will be determined by the Voronoi partition of the torus, i.e., every point w such that $d(v, w) < d'(u, w)$ will be colored *blue*, and every point w such that $d'(u, w) < d(v, w)$ will be colored *red*.

4 Urn Result

Finally we discuss the urn result we used extensively. The urn model discussed here is finite, i.e., its matrix has negative eigenvalues, which means that eventually there will be no balls left in the urn. The next theorem defines the urn model, and provides a concentration result for the values of S_n, Z_n throughout the process.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume $0 < a < b$ are positive integers. Let S_n and Z_n be the number of balls in the urn process with scheme $\begin{pmatrix} -a & 0 \\ b-a & -b \end{pmatrix}$ and let $M = S_0 + Z_0$. Denote the processes*

$$K_n = \frac{Z_n}{Z_0(1 - an/M)^{b/a}}, \quad \text{and} \quad L_n = \frac{S_n}{(M - an) - Z_0(1 - an/M)^{b/a}},$$

and the stopping time $\sigma_{Z_0, M}$ as the smallest integer n such that $Z_n = 0$. For fixed positive $\varepsilon < 1/2$ and t define $n_{1,t} = \lfloor M(1 - tZ_0^{-a/b})/a \rfloor$ and $n_{2,t} = \lfloor M(1 - t^{-1}Z_0^{-a/b})/a \rfloor$ and consider the event

$$\mathbf{K}_{Z_0, M, t, \varepsilon} = \{|K_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}\}.$$

Then

a) There exists a universal constant C (not depending on Z_0, M, ε and t) such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{K}_{Z_0, M, t, \varepsilon}) \geq 1 - \frac{C}{t^{b/a}\varepsilon^2}, \quad \text{for all } t \geq \frac{CZ_0^{a/b}}{M\varepsilon} \quad (58)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{Z_0, M} \geq n_{2,t}) \leq \frac{C}{t^{b/(2b-a)}}, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 1. \quad (59)$$

b) For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a positive sequence $(\lambda_{\varepsilon, M})_M$ converging to 0 such that for all $0 \leq Z_0 \leq M$

$$\mathbb{P}(|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq n < M/a) \geq 1 - \lambda_{\varepsilon, M}.$$

Proof. a) The condition on t in (58) ensures that when C is large enough, we have $M - an_{1,t} > 2a + 2b$, so we assume this condition throughout the proof of (58). Define the stopping time τ as the first time n such that $Z_n \leq 2a + 2b$ and $K'_n = K_{n \wedge \tau}$. First observe that $K'_0 = 1$ and that $Z_n + S_n = M - an$. Denote by $\mathcal{F}_n$ the σ -algebra generated by the first n draws. It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(K'_{n+1} - K'_n | \mathcal{F}_n) &= \left(\frac{Z_n}{Z_0(1 - \frac{an+a}{M})^{b/a}} - \frac{Z_n}{Z_0(1 - \frac{an}{M})^{b/a}} - \frac{bZ_n}{Z_0(1 - \frac{an+a}{M})^{b/a}(M - an)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\tau > n} \\ &= \frac{Z_n}{Z_0(1 - \frac{an}{M})^{b/a}} \left(\left(1 + \frac{a}{M - an - a}\right)^{b/a} \left(1 - \frac{b}{M - an}\right) - 1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\tau > n}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Take a constant C_1 (which depends on a and b only) such that for any n satisfying $M - an \geq 2a + 2b$ we have

$$\left| \left(1 + \frac{a}{M - an - a}\right)^{b/a} - 1 - \frac{b}{M - an - a} \right| \leq \frac{C_1}{(M - an - a)^2},$$

which after plugging in (60) gives

$$|\mathbb{E}(K'_{n+1} - K'_n | \mathcal{F}_n)| \leq \frac{Z_{n \wedge \tau}}{Z_0(1 - \frac{a(n \wedge \tau)}{M})^{b/a}} \left(\frac{b}{M - an - a} - \frac{b}{M - an} + \frac{C_1}{(M - an - a)^2} \right).$$

This implies that for some constant $C_2 = C_2(a, b)$ and any n satisfying $M - an \geq 2a + 2b$ we have

$$|\mathbb{E}(K'_{n+1} - K'_n | \mathcal{F}_n)| \leq K'_n \frac{C_2}{(M - an)^2}. \quad (61)$$

Furthermore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}((K'_{n+1} - K'_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) &\leq \left(\frac{Z_{n \wedge \tau}}{Z_0(1 - \frac{a(n \wedge \tau) + a}{M})^{b/a}} - \frac{Z_{n \wedge \tau}}{Z_0(1 - \frac{a(n \wedge \tau)}{M})^{b/a}} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{b}{Z_0(1 - \frac{a(n \wedge \tau) + a}{M})^{b/a}} \right)^2 \frac{Z_{n \wedge \tau}}{M - a(n \wedge \tau)} \\ &\leq 2K_n'^2 \left(\left(\left(1 + \frac{a}{M - a(n \wedge \tau) - a}\right)^{b/a} - 1 \right)^2 + \frac{b^2}{Z_{n \wedge \tau}(M - a(n \wedge \tau))} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Using the same arguments as before and that $Z_k \leq M - ak$, we have that there is a constant $C_3 = C_3(a, b)$ such that whenever $M - an \geq 2a + 2b$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}((K'_{n+1} - K'_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq K_n'^2 \frac{C_3}{Z_{n \wedge \tau}(M - a(n \wedge \tau))} \leq K_n' \frac{C_3 M^{b/a}}{Z_0(M - an)^{b/a+1}}. \quad (62)$$

Define $p_n = \frac{C_2}{(M - an)^2}$, $q_{\ell, k} = \prod_{i=\ell}^k (1 + p_i)$ for $\ell \leq k$ and $q_{k+1, k} = 1$ and $r_n = \frac{C_3 M^{b/a}}{Z_0(M - an)^{b/a+1}}$. Since $q_{\ell, k} \leq \exp\left(\sum_{i=\ell}^k p_i\right)$ we see that there is a constant C_4 such that $q_{\ell, k} \leq C_4$ for any ℓ and k . Then we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n_{1,t}-1} r_k q_{0, k-1} \leq C_4 \frac{C_3 M^{b/a}}{Z_0} \sum_{k=0}^{n_{1,t}-1} \frac{1}{(M - ak)^{b/a+1}} \leq \frac{C_5 M^{b/a}}{Z_0(M - a(n_{1,t} - 1))^{b/a}} \leq \frac{C_5}{t^{b/a}}.$$

Defining $I_0 = K'_0 = 1$ and $I_n = K'_n - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}(K'_{k+1} - K'_k | \mathcal{F}_k)$, as in Lemma 2.6 we have that

$$\mathbb{E}((I_{n_1,t} - 1)^2) \leq \frac{C_5}{t^{b/a}},$$

and by a Doob's maximal theorem we have that for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(\max_{0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}} |I_n - 1| \geq \delta) \leq \delta^{-2} \mathbb{E}(\max_{0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}} |I_n - 1|^2) \leq \frac{2C_5}{t^{b/a}\delta^2}.$$

Next note that for any $0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}$ we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k q_{k+1,n-1} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n_{1,t}-1} \frac{C_4 C_2}{(M - an)^2} \leq \frac{C_6}{M - a(n_{1,t} - 1)} \leq \frac{C_6 Z_0^{a/b}}{Mt}.$$

Conditioned on the event that $|I_n - 1| \leq \delta$, for all $0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}$ by Lemma 2.6 we have for all $0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}$ that

$$|K'_n - 1| \leq \delta + (1 + \delta) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_k q_{k+1,n-1} \leq \delta + (1 + \delta) \frac{C_6 Z_0^{a/b}}{Mt}.$$

Denoting the right hand side above by ε and taking $t \geq \frac{C Z_0^{a/b}}{M\varepsilon}$ for sufficiently large C we get $\delta \geq \varepsilon/2$. Thus with probability of at least $1 - \frac{8C_5}{t^{b/a}\varepsilon^2}$ we have that $|K'_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}$. Now the claim in (58) is trivial if $t^{b/a} \leq C\varepsilon^{-2}$. Surely by increasing C if necessary we can conclude that for any $\varepsilon < 1/2$ and $t^{b/a} > C\varepsilon^{-2}$ we have $2(a+b)t^{-b/a} < 1 - \varepsilon$. Since assuming $\tau < n_{1,t}$ implies

$$K'_\tau \leq \frac{2(a+b)}{Z_0 \left(1 - \frac{a\tau}{M}\right)^{b/a}} \leq \frac{2(a+b)}{t^{b/a}} < 1 - \varepsilon,$$

we conclude that the condition that $|K'_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}$ implies $\tau \geq n_{1,t}$ and thus also $K'_n = K_n$ for all $0 \leq n \leq n_{1,t}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{K}_{Z_0, M, t, \varepsilon}) \geq 1 - \frac{C}{t^{b/a}\varepsilon^2},$$

for C large enough, which proves the inequality in (58).

To prove that $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{Z_0, M} \geq n_{2,t}) \leq \frac{C}{t^{b/(2b-a)}}$, first observe that the proportion of Z -type balls $Z_n/(M - an)$ is a supermartingale if $M - an > a$. To check this calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Z_{n+1}}{M - a(n+1)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right) - \frac{Z_n}{M - an} &= \frac{Z_n}{M - a(n+1)} - \frac{b}{M - a(n+1)} \frac{Z_n}{M - an} - \frac{Z_n}{M - an} \\ &= -\frac{(b-a)Z_n}{(M - an)(M - a(n+1))}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for $n_1 < n_{2,t}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_{n_{2,t}} | \mathcal{F}_{n_1}) \leq \frac{M - an_{2,t}}{M - an_1} \mathbb{E}(Z_{n_1} | \mathcal{F}_{n_1}). \quad (63)$$

Next define $s = t^{a/(2b-a)}$ and $n_1 = n_{1,s}$. Note that by (58), we see that conditioned on the event $\mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,s,1/2}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_{n_2,t} | \mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,s,1/2}) \leq \frac{3}{2} \left(1 - \frac{an_{2,t}}{M}\right) \left(1 - \frac{an_{1,s}}{M}\right)^{b/a-1} Z_0 \leq \frac{3}{2} t^{-1} s^{b/a-1} \leq \frac{3}{2} t^{-b/(2b-a)}. \quad (64)$$

Since $s \geq 1 \geq 2CZ_0^{a/b}M^{-1}$ for M large enough, by (58) we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,s,1/2}^c) \leq \frac{4C}{s^{b/a}}$ and (64) with Markov inequality imply

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{n_2,t} > 0) \leq \mathbb{E}(Z_{n_2,t} | \mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,s,1/2}) + \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,s,1/2}^c) \leq \frac{C}{t^{b/(2b-a)}},$$

for large enough C , which proves (59) (note that the proof works if $M - an_{2,t} \geq a$, which is something we can assume since the last drawn ball can not be of Z -type).

b) We start by writing

$$L_n = \frac{(M - an) - Z_n}{(M - an) - Z_0 \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a}},$$

from where we easily get

$$L_n - 1 = \frac{Z_0 \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a} - Z_n}{(M - an) - Z_0 \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|L_n - 1|}{|L_n - 1|} = \frac{M}{Z_0 \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1}} - 1. \quad (65)$$

First consider all n such that

$$\frac{\log M}{Z_0^{a/b}} \leq 1 - \frac{an}{M} \leq \left(\frac{M}{2Z_0}\right)^{a/(b-a)}. \quad (66)$$

From the second relation in (65) it is easy to check that the event $\mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,\log M,\varepsilon}$ implies that $|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all n satisfying (66). For a given $\varepsilon > 0$ choose M large enough so that $\log M \geq \frac{C}{M^{1-a/b\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{CZ_0^{a/b}}{M\varepsilon}$. Then by (58) we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon, \text{ for all } n \text{ satisfying (66)}) \geq 1 - \frac{C}{(\log M)^{b/a\varepsilon^2}}. \quad (67)$$

Recall the definition of $n_{1,t}$ from the statement. Now conditioned on the event $\mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,\log M,\varepsilon/2}$ we have that

$$Z_{n_{1,\log M}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2) Z_0 \left(1 - \frac{an_{1,\log M}}{M}\right)^{b/a} \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2) (\log M)^{b/a}.$$

Thus, conditioned on $\mathbf{K}_{Z_0,M,\log M,\varepsilon/2}$, we have that for all n satisfying

$$\frac{1}{Z_0^{a/b} \log M} \leq 1 - \frac{an}{M} \leq \frac{\log M}{Z_0^{a/b}}, \quad (68)$$

holds $0 \leq Z_n \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2) (\log M)^{b/a}$, and from the first relation in (65) we get

$$-\frac{(1 + \varepsilon/2) (\log M)^{b/a}}{\frac{M}{Z_0^{a/b} \log M} - (\log M)^{b/a}} \leq L_n - 1 \leq \frac{(\log M)^{b/a}}{\frac{M}{Z_0^{a/b} \log M} - (\log M)^{b/a}}.$$

Since the denominator of both the left and the right hand side above is bounded from below by $M^{1-a/b}/\log M - (\log M)^{b/a}$, we conclude that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ with probability converging to 1 we have that $|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$, for all n satisfying (68).

Next consider n such that

$$0 < 1 - \frac{an}{M} \leq \frac{1}{Z_0^{a/b} \log M}. \quad (69)$$

By (59), with probability of at least $1 - \frac{C}{(\log M)^{b/(2b-a)}}$ we have that $Z_n = 0$ and $S_n = M - an$ for all n satisfying (69). Therefore, with probability converging to 1, for all such n , we have that

$$1 \leq L_n = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{Z_0}{M} \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{Z_0^{a/b}}{M(\log M)^{b/a-1}}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - M^{-1+a/b}(\log M)^{-b/a+1}}.$$

The above arguments show that for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ with probability converging to 1 (uniformly in Z_0) as $M \rightarrow \infty$, we have that $|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all n such that $0 < 1 - \frac{an}{M} \leq (M/2Z_0)^{a/(b-a)}$. If $Z_0 \leq M/2$ there is nothing left to prove, so assume $Z_0 \geq M/2$.

Now consider the case when

$$\left(\frac{M}{2Z_0}\right)^{a/(b-a)} \leq 1 - \frac{an}{M} \leq 1 - \frac{\log M}{\sqrt{M}}. \quad (70)$$

By the second relation in (65) the condition that

$$|K_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon \left(M Z_0^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{\log M}{\sqrt{M}} \right)^{-b/a+1} - 1 \right) \quad (71)$$

holds for all n satisfying (70), implies that $|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all n satisfying (70). To calculate the probability of (71) holding for all n satisfying (70), we can apply (58) with $t = Z_0(M/2)^{a/(b-a)}$.

This application is justified by the fact that t satisfies the condition $t \geq \frac{C Z_0^{a/b}}{M \varepsilon}$ for ε fixed and M large enough, and the fact that the right hand side of (71) is bounded from below by $\varepsilon/2$. Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } n \text{ satisfying (70)}) &\geq 1 - \frac{2^{b/(b-a)} C}{Z_0^{b/a} M^{b/(b-a)} \varepsilon^2 \left(M Z_0^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{\log M}{\sqrt{M}} \right)^{-b/a+1} - 1 \right)^2} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2^{b^2/(a(b-a))} C}{M^{b^2/(a(b-a))} \varepsilon^2 \left(\left(1 - \frac{\log M}{\sqrt{M}} \right)^{-b/a+1} - 1 \right)^2} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2^{b^2/(a(b-a))} a^2 C}{(b-a)^2 \varepsilon^2 (\log M)^2 M^{b^2/(a(b-a))-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where in the last line we used the inequality $(1-x)^{-\gamma} \geq 1 + \gamma x$, for all $\gamma > 0$ and $0 < x < 1$, with $\gamma = b/a$ and $x = \log M/\sqrt{M}$.

Since the right hand side of (72) converges to 1, we are left to consider the case when $0 \leq n \leq (\sqrt{M} \log M)/a$. To this end write

$$L_n = \frac{S_n}{\left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right) \left(S_0 \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1} + M \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1}\right) \right)}.$$

Consider the case when $S_0 \geq \sqrt{M}(\log M)^2$ and so $S_0(1 - \varepsilon/2) \leq S_n \leq S_0(1 + \varepsilon/2)$, for M large enough and all n such that $0 \leq n \leq (\sqrt{M} \log M)/a$. Furthermore, for such n the denominator satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{\log M}{\sqrt{M}}\right)^{b/a} S_0 &\leq \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right) \left(S_0 \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1} + M \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1}\right)\right) \\ &\leq S_0 + M \frac{(b-a)n}{M} \leq S_0 + \frac{b-a}{a} \sqrt{M} \log M, \end{aligned}$$

and so it is bounded by $S_0(1 - \varepsilon/2)$ from below and by $S_0(1 + \varepsilon/2)$ from above, for M large enough. This now implies the deterministic fact that $|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq n \leq (\sqrt{M} \log M)/a$.

We are left to consider $S_0 \leq \sqrt{M}(\log M)^2$, so from now on we assume this. The last two cases we consider are

$$0 \leq n \leq \sqrt{M}/(\log M)^3, \quad (73)$$

and

$$\sqrt{M}/(\log M)^3 \leq n \leq (\sqrt{M} \log M)/a. \quad (74)$$

Clearly for M large enough and all n satisfying (73) or 74 we have $S_n \leq 2\sqrt{M}(\log M)^2$. Thus the probability of drawing an S -type ball at the n th step for n satisfying (73) is bounded from above by $3(\log M)^2/\sqrt{M}$ and the expectation of the total number of S -type balls drawn in this time interval is less than $3/\log M$. By Markov inequality, with probability converging to 1, in this time interval we will draw only Z -type balls which implies that with probability converging to 1 as $M \rightarrow \infty$ we have for all n satisfying (73)

$$L_n = \frac{S_0 + (b-a)n}{\left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right) \left(S_0 \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1} + M \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1}\right)\right)}.$$

For M large enough and for all n satisfying (73) or (74) we have

$$\frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon/2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon/2}, \text{ and } \frac{(b-a)n}{1 + \varepsilon/2} \leq M \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1}\right) \leq \frac{(b-a)n}{1 - \varepsilon/2}. \quad (75)$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that

$$\left|1 - \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1} - \frac{(b-a)n}{M}\right| \leq \frac{C'n^2}{M^2} \leq \frac{C' \log M}{a(b-a)M} (b-a)n,$$

for some constant $C' > 0$. From (75) it is clear that $|L_n - 1| \leq \varepsilon$ for all n satisfying (73).

Using similar arguments as above we see that the expected number of S -type balls drawn for ns satisfying (74) is no more than $3(\log M)^3$ for large M . Thus with high probability we have

$$S_0 + (b-a)n - (\log M)^4 \leq S_n \leq S_0 + (b-a)n.$$

The upper bound on $L_n - 1$ follows from the arguments above and for the lower bound we only need to modify the second inequality in (75) as

$$\frac{(b-a)n - (\log M)^4}{1 + \varepsilon/2} \leq M \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{an}{M}\right)^{b/a-1}\right) \leq \frac{(b-a)n - (\log M)^4}{1 - \varepsilon/2},$$

which holds for M large enough and all n satisfying (74).

□

References

- [1] C. Asavathiratham, S. Roy, B. Lesieutre, and G. Verghese. The influence model. *IEEE Control Systems*, 2001.
- [2] Noam Berger, Christian Borgs, Jennifer T. Chayes, and Amin Saberi. On the spread of viruses on the internet. In *SODA*, pages 301–310, 2005.
- [3] Shankar Bhamidi. First passage percolation on locally treelike networks. I. Dense random graphs. *J. Math. Phys.*, 49(12):125218, 27, 2008.
- [4] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. First passage percolation on erdős-renyi random graphs. preprint, available at arXiv:1005.4104 [math.PR].
- [5] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. Extreme value theory, Poisson-Dirichlet distributions, and first passage percolation on random networks. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 42(3):706–738, 2010.
- [6] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. First passage percolation on random graphs with finite mean degrees. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 20(5):1907–1965, 2010.
- [7] Shishir Bharathi, David Kempe, and Mahyar Salek. Competitive influence maximization in social networks. In Xiaotie Deng and Fan Graham, editors, *Internet and Network Economics*, volume 4858 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 306–311. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2007.
- [8] B. Bollobás. A probabilistic proof of an asymptotic formula for the number of labelled regular graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 1(4):311–316, 1980.
- [9] Béla Bollobás. *Random graphs*, volume 73 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2001.
- [10] Maury Bramson and David Griffeath. Asymptotics for interacting particle systems on $\mathbf{Z}^d$. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 53:183–196, 1980.
- [11] P Brémaud. *Markov chains: Gibbs fields, Monte Carlo simulation, and queues*. Springer, Berlin, 2001.
- [12] J. Brown and P. Reinegen. Social ties and word-of-mouth referral behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14:350?–362, 1987.
- [13] Peter Clifford and Aidan Sudbury. A model for spatial conflict. *Biometrika*, 60:581–588, 1973.
- [14] J. Theodore Cox and Richard Durrett. Some limit theorems for percolation processes with necessary and sufficient conditions. *Ann. Probab.*, 9(4):583–603, 1981.
- [15] Maria Deijfen and Olle Häggström. The initial configuration is irrelevant for the possibility of mutual unbounded growth in the two-type Richardson model. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 15(3):345–353, 2006.

- [16] Maria Deijfen and Olle Häggström. Nonmonotonic coexistence regions for the two-type Richardson model on graphs. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 11:no. 13, 331–344 (electronic), 2006.
- [17] Maria Deijfen and Olle Häggström. The two-type Richardson model with unbounded initial configurations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 17(5-6):1639–1656, 2007.
- [18] P. Domingos and M. Richardson. Mining the network value of customers. In *Proceedings of the 7th Intl. Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 57–66, 2001.
- [19] Peter Donnelly and Dominic Welsh. Finite particle systems and infection models. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 94(1):167–182, 1983.
- [20] R. Durrett. *Lecture Notes on Particle Systems and Percolation*. Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1988.
- [21] Rick Durrett and Paul Jung. Two phase transitions for the contact process on small worlds. Submitted, 2006.
- [22] D. A. Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *Ann. Probability*, 3:100–118, 1975.
- [23] Olivier Garet and Régine Marchand. First-passage competition with different speeds: positive density for both species is impossible. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 13:no. 70, 2118–2159, 2008.
- [24] Roy J. Glauber. Time-dependent statistics of the Ising model. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 4:294–307, 1963.
- [25] J. Goldenberg, B. Libai, and E. Muller. Talk of the network: A complex systems look at the underlying process of word-of-mouth. *Marketing Letters*, 12:211–223, 2001.
- [26] J. Goldenberg, B. Libai, and E. Muller. Using complex systems analysis to advance marketing theory development: Modeling heterogeneity effects on new product growth through stochastic cellular automata. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2001.
- [27] David Griffeath. The basic contact processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 11(2):151–185, May 1981.
- [28] Olle Häggström and Robin Pemantle. First passage percolation and a model for competing spatial growth. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 35(3):683–692, 1998.
- [29] Olle Häggström and Robin Pemantle. Absence of mutual unbounded growth for almost all parameter values in the two-type Richardson model. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 90(2):207–222, 2000.
- [30] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 58:13–30, 1963.
- [31] Christopher Hoffman. Coexistence for Richardson type competing spatial growth models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(1B):739–747, 2005.
- [32] Christopher Hoffman. Geodesics in first passage percolation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 18(5):1944–1969, 2008.

- [33] Richard A. Holley and Thomas M. Liggett. Ergodic theorems for weakly interacting infinite systems and the voter model. *Ann. Probability*, 3(4):643–663, 1975.
- [34] Svante Janson. One, two and three times $\log n/n$ for paths in a complete graph with random weights. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 8(4):347–361, 1999. Random graphs and combinatorial structures (Oberwolfach, 1997).
- [35] Svante Janson. Limit theorems for triangular urn schemes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 134(3):417–452, 2006.
- [36] Svante Janson, Tomasz Łuczak, and Andrzej Ruciński. *Random graphs*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2000.
- [37] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and E. Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proc. 9th ACM SIGKDD Intl. Conf. on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2003.
- [38] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and E. Tardos. Influential nodes in a diffusion model for social networks. In *Proc. 32nd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, 2005.
- [39] Harry Kesten. Aspects of first passage percolation. In *École d’été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XIV—1984*, volume 1180 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 125–264. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [40] Thomas M. Liggett. *Interacting particle systems*, volume 276 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.
- [41] Thomas M. Liggett. *Stochastic interacting systems: contact, voter and exclusion processes*, volume 324 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [42] Hosam Mahmoud. *Polya Urn models*. Texts in statistical science series. Taylor & Francis Ltd, 2008.
- [43] M. Morris, editor. *Network Epidemiology*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [44] Elchanan Mossel and Sebastien Roch. Submodularity of influence in social networks: from local to global. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(6):2176–2188, 2010.
- [45] M. Richardson and P. Domingos. Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing. In *Proceedings of the 8th Intl. Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 61–70, 2002.
- [46] Remco van der Hofstad, Gerard Hooghiemstra, and Piet Van Mieghem. The flooding time in random graphs. *Extremes*, 5(2):111–129 (2003), 2002.
- [47] Stanley Wasserman and Katherine Faust. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

- [48] S. Wolfram. *Theory and Applications of Cellular Automata: Including Selected Papers, 1983-1985*. World Scientific, 1986.